STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Quarterly review of the evange
v.1 1871 Evangelical Lutheran Church
0 0001 00658554 9

REFERENCE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY
1745

COLLECTIONS

04-79-740-3

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG
PENNSYLVANIA

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY

J. A. BROWN, D. D., AND M. VALENTINE, D. D.,

WITH THE SPECIAL COÖPERATION OF

S. SPRECHER, D. D.
REV. C. A. STORK.
A. C. WEDEKIND, D. D.
REV. J. H. W. STUCKENBURG.

NEW SERIES—VOL. I.

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG
PENNSYLVANIA

GETTYSBURG:
J. E. WIBLE, PRINTER, COR. OF WASHINGTON AND NORTH STREETS.
1871.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol1quarterlyrev00unse

INDEX TO VOL. I.

American Colleges, 143.
Apocalypse of St. John, 535.
Assurance of Faith, The, 280.
Atonement, The, Notice of, 629.
Augsburg Confession, Article VI., 485.
Baltzley, Rev. J. B., Art. by, 384.
Barker's Chemistry, Notice of, 319.
Baum, Dr. W. M., Art. by, 384.
Beck, Dr. J. T. of Tübingen, 111.
Benevolence, Systematic, 13.
Bikle, Prof. P. M., Art. by, 445.
Book of Worship, 146.
Brown, Dr. J. A., Art. by, 1, 146, 241, 585.
Children of the Church, Religious Training of, 520.
Children's Crusade, Notice of, 159.
Christianity and Positivism, Notice of, 473.
Church-Love among our People, 434.
Codex Sinaiticus, 122.
Colleges, American, 143.
Conrad, Dr. F. W., Art. by, 557.
Conservative Reformation, Notice of, 458.
Companion to the Bible, Notice of 161.
Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces, The, Notice of, 319.
Culture and the Gospel, Notice of, 318.
Culture and Religion, Notice of, 469.
Diehl, Dr. George, Art. by, 434.
Döllinger's Reply to Archbishop of Munich, on Papal Infallibility, 606.
Domestic Life of Thos. Jefferson, Notice of, 630.
Education, its Aims and Results, 384.
Education, Female, 445.
English Language, Method of Studying, 57.
Essay on the Ministerial Office, Notice of, 156.
Faith, Assurance of, 280.
Female Education, 445.
Ferrier, Prof. E., Art. by, 57, 140, 325.
Fink, Rev. R. A., Art. by, 343.
Four Years at Yale, Notice of, 636.
France and the Allied Powers at Waterloo, 325.
Fresh Leaves in the Book and its Story, Notice of, 476.
Gardiner's Greek Harmony, Notice of, 634.
Genesis of Species, by St. Geo. Mivart, Notice of, 477.
German Empire, The, 413.
God's Rescues, Notice of, 481.
Gotwald, Rev. L. A., Art. by, 221.
Greek Praxis, Notice of, 159.
Guthrie, Dr. Thomas, Art. by, 396.
Hay, Dr. C. A., Art. by, 122.
Heydenreich, Rev. L. W., Art. by, 535.
History of Protestant Theology; Dr. Dorner's Introduction, 21.
Holman Lecture, 485.
Home Missionary Organization in the General Synod, 195.
Infallibility, Papal, 585.

81704

Infallibility, Decree of, 587.
Intermediate State, The, 268.
Iron Age of Germany, Notice of, 156.
Jacobs, Prof. H. E., Art. by, 280.
Javelin, The, Notice of, 629.
Jesus: His Life and Work, Notice of, 635.
Kuhns, Rev. L. M., Art. by, 520.
Lange's Commentary on Jeremiah, and on St. John, Notice of, 632.
Life of Dickens, Notice of, 161.
Lord's Prayer, The, Notice of, 317.
Loy, Prof. M., Art. by, 67.
Luther's House-Postil, Notice of, 628.
Lutheran Church, Union in, 241.
Lyell's Geology, Notice of, 631.
Manual of Ancient History, Notice of, 630.
Method of Studying the English Language, 57.
Missions, Home, 195.
Mission of the Spirit, Notice of, 634.
New Obedience, 485.
Officer, Rev. M., Art. by, 195.
Papal Infallibility, 585.
Pastor of the Future, The, 300.
Person of Christ, 465.
Poets and Poetry of Europe, The, Notice of, 315.
Presbyterian Re-union Memorial Vol., Notice of, 316.
Problem of Evil, Notice of, 633.
Proposed Religious Amendment to our National Constitution, 221.
Prose Writers of America, The, Notice of, 314.
Prose Writers of Germany, The, Notice of, 314.
Protoplasm, J. S. Hutchison's Essay on, Notice of, 320.
Pulpit, The, 396.
Reason not a Rule of Faith, 67.
Reindeer, Dogs, and Snow-Shoes, Notice of, 631.
Religious Training of the Children of the Church, 520.
Review, The, 1.
Robinson, Dr. T. H., Art. by, 34.
Science for the Young, Notice of, 631.
Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ. The, Notice of, 465.
Severinghaus, Rev. J. D., Art. by, 413.
Sheeleigh, Rev. M., Art. by, 97.
Sinaiticus, Codex, 122.
Socrates and Arnold, 31.
Songs for the Sanctuary, Notice of, 160.
Spirit of the Age, 365.
Sprecher, Dr. S., Art. by, 21.
Strange-Fire Worshipers, 343.
Stork, Rev. C. A., Art. by, 13, 300, 485.
Stuckenberg, Rev. J. H. W., Art. by 111.
Sunday School, Relation to the Church, 97.
Sunday School Idea, The, Notice of, 162.
Swartz, Dr. Joel, Art. by, 365.
Systematic Benevolence, 13.
Teacher, Ancient and Modern, 34.
Theistic Argument from Final Causes, 165.
Times of Daniel, The, Notice of, 481.
Treatise on Regeneration, Notice of, 629.
Union in the Lutheran Church, 241.
Valentine, Dr. M., Art. by, 165.
Whedon on Acts and Romans, Notice of, 634.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JANUARY, 1871.

THE REVIEW.

Some exposition of the object and aims of the *Review* may naturally be expected to open this number. Due respect for the views and opinions of others would seem to require that some explanation should be given of the design of those, who invite their confidence and co-operation. In undertaking its editorial charge, therefore, and presenting the Review under a new name, and somewhat changed in appearance and character, it will not be deemed presumptuous or superfluous, to address a few words to its readers, that they, and the Church, may understand our motives, and the principles, by which we expect to be guided and governed.

For twenty-one years a Theological Quarterly has been published at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. The Institutions here, and the Church at large, have learned to look upon its continuance as a matter of course. A very brief survey of its establishment and history will form a fitting introduction

to the new regime under which it now appears, as "THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH."

The *Evangelical Review* was originated and established by the Rev. W. M. Reynolds, then living in Gettysburg, and Professor of Latin in Pennsylvania College. To his enterprise, zeal, and liberal views, it owes its first existence. To this work Prof. Reynolds brought special qualifications. His large acquaintance with the history and men of our Church in this country, his extensive and varied scholarship, together with his classical attainments, rendered him peculiarly fitted for the undertaking. Along with himself, Prof. Reynolds associated several of the ripest scholars and ablest theologians of the Church. This, at once, secured for the Review a character, and the earlier volumes contain a variety and richness of material, that make them of great value, especially in reference to the history and doctrines of our Lutheran Church. The first number was issued, July 1849.

Prof. Reynolds did not long continue alone, as editor in chief, of the Review. His removal from Gettysburg, to another field of labor, in 1850, necessitated a change, so as to have an acting editor on the ground. For this important post Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sen., Professor in the Theological Seminary, was selected. The choice could hardly have fallen on one better qualified. Dr. Krauth's broad, catholic spirit, united with his true devotion to the interests of the Lutheran Church, his acquaintance with the German language and literature, as well as his passion for reading, in nearly every department of study, qualified him in a special degree for that general supervision which he was to exercise. Although he wrote less than some others, whose ability and scholarship were far from being equal to his, yet he contributed in various ways to sustain the character, and further the interests of the Review. Of two such editors, as Drs. Krauth and Reynolds, any Theological Review might justly be proud. By them it continued to be edited until 1857, when, in consequence of the distance of Dr. Reynolds from the place of publication, and the failing health of Dr. Krauth, Prof. M. L. Stoever, of Pennsylvania College, was associated with them

in the editorial work. In making this arrangement for the services of Prof. Stoever, it was announced that it "Will enable the other editors to devote increased attention to other departments of the work, and especially to our German and other foreign theology, upon which it is a part of our design to bestow more attention than we have hitherto done." During the editorship of Drs. Krauth and Reynolds, the important department of foreign theology and literature was not overlooked.

In 1861, on account of "impaired health," Dr. Krauth withdrew from the active duties as editor of the Review. His colleagues gracefully acknowledged his valuable services, during the time he had been leading editor. In 1862, Dr. Reynolds, in consequence of other plans and engagements, also withdrew from editorial connection with the Review, leaving its management entirely in the hands of Prof. Stoever. The loss of Drs. Krauth and Reynolds from the Review, to one of whom it owed its existence, and to both of whom it was so deeply indebted, could not but be felt, especially in some departments; yet Prof. Stoever devoted himself with untiring zeal and diligence to sustain its character and maintain its circulation. A marked feature, and one which, to many readers, gave great satisfaction, in the editorship of Prof. Stoever, was his Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. These, and other papers in the Review, from his pen, will furnish material of great value, for the future historian of the Lutheran Church. The sudden and lamented death of Dr. Stoever, in July last, left the Review without an editor. These repeated changes, and the removal, by death, of two who had been editors, may serve to remind us of the permanence of God's work in the Church, compared with the frailty of the instruments by which it is carried forward. Whatever is of the divine planting and nurturing will continue to live, though men may fail and die.

In surveying the past twenty-one years of its existence, it must be acknowledged by all, that the Review has answered an important end, as "a medium for the interchange of thought in the Church, and for the cultivation and preserva-

tion of its history, literature and theology, in a convenient and appropriate form."

It may be due to the present editors of the Quarterly Review to say a word about their connection with it. The death of the late editor of the Evangelical Quarterly Review, leaving no one connected with it to continue its publication, necessarily gave rise to the question, What will the Church do for a Review? The Evangelical Review having been originated at Gettysburg, and published here during the whole period of its existence, by general consent, Gettysburg was regarded as the place for the continued publication of such a Journal. Various reasons for this will readily occur to every reader, who is acquainted with the Lutheran Church in this country, or who understands the nature and relations of a Theological Quarterly. No others seeming willing to undertake the task, and being urgently pressed to do something to meet the emergency, the present editors, after much reflection and consultation, reluctantly consented to assume the responsibility.

They have not been moved thereto, by any hopes or expectations of large pecuniary reward, for they have always understood that the Review afforded no adequate return for the trouble it cost, and the labor bestowed upon it. But they could not disregard the indications of Providence, and the expectation of the Church in this matter. They enter upon the work from a conviction of duty, and in the hope of doing good in the Church, and serving the cause of Christ.

Conscious of the importance and difficulty of the work, in which they engage, and not relying alone on their own labors, the editors will have associated with them, in different sections of the Church, those, whose aid will be a guarantee for greater efficiency, and that the reasonable expectations of the Church will not be disappointed.

The need of such a Review will not be questioned by any one at all acquainted with the subject, or competent to form a judgment. If it was a want in the Church twenty-one years ago, it is much more now. During that period the Lutheran Church in the United States has increased nearly

threefold, and is now very rapidly growing. Her resources and wants alike demand such an agency, to aid in developing the one, and in meeting the other. No other denomination, with anything like equal strength, is without its Quarterly Review of this character, and the conviction is settled in all Churches, that denominational respectability, as well as efficient usefulness, requires such a publication. The editors of the Evangelical Review, in an appeal addressed "to the ministers and members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America," in the year 1856, say in language which we can only reiterate, "As to its continuance, there ought, we think, to be but one opinion. If it came into existence to meet felt wants, if our Church needed such an organ, to furnish a vehicle for the edification of her children, if, in establishing it, she was treading in the footsteps of the mother Church in Germany, and the most enlightened and numerous churches in various parts of Christendom, the inducements to go forward have not diminished, but increased. * * * * *. When we see what others around us are doing, how cordially they cherish their Quarterlies, and devote to them their best talents, we ought not to withdraw and proclaim to the world, that we have nothing to say, either for ourselves, or the common cause of our Master. *The Review ought to be a fixture in the Church, and to live, when we who now live, have gone to eternity.*" These words, penned by the venerable senior editor of the Review, come to us with all the solemnity of a voice from the other world, bidding us not to let the Review die, but to let it live on, when one workman after another ceases from his labors.

But urgent and manifest as may be the need of such a Review, the difficulties in meeting it are very great. These were felt and encountered at the outset, twenty-one years ago, and they have only increased with time. The fact cannot, and need not, be overlooked, that the Lutheran Church in the United States is far from being united and harmonious. It is even less united to-day than it was when the Evangelical Review was started. This is chiefly owing to the very large accessions to the Church from abroad, and the political

changes which have taken place in our country. We have divisions now caused by the late civil war, divisions growing out of difference of language and nationality, as well as from difference in doctrinal views and usages. Whilst some of these diversities may be the result of human weakness and error, and ought not to exist, others are altogether beyond human control, and it is more than idle to lament their existence. They belong to the providential government of God, and it is the part of wise men to recognize the fact of these diversities, and to do what they can to prevent unpleasant jarrings and to promote harmony of feeling and action.

When the Review was first established, the only union of Lutheran Synods in one general body, was that of the General Synod. Some of the larger district Synods were not even in existence at that time. Now we have, in addition to the General Synod, the General Synod of North America, the General Council, with a number of the largest Synods not in connection with any of these bodies. Notwithstanding the transition from German to English, and the rapid growth of the use of English in our churches, so great have been the additions from foreign countries, that the English then had, probably, greater relative prevalence in the Church than it has now. Thus far, all efforts to unite the entire Lutheran element in this country, in one organized body, have proved a failure, and such a consummation still remains only as an object of hope and expectation in the future. Every genuine lover of his Church must earnestly desire to see the evils resulting from our divided condition removed, and all parts of the Church laboring harmoniously in the one great cause of evangelizing the world.

With these divisions, and divergencies from various causes, it would seem almost hopeless to expect that any Review that may be published, will give entire satisfaction to all parties, or secure the cordial and generous support of all. However much this may be desired, it is almost too much to expect in the present condition of the Church. And yet for each party in the Church, to attempt to sustain a Review of its own would be the certain failure of most, if not all of them.

Such a ruinous course ought not to be adopted. Something better than this surely can be accomplished.

Whilst it may not be practicable to publish a Review satisfactory to all portions of the Lutheran Church, it is believed that one may be published that will so far give satisfaction as to secure the countenance and support of many in all sections, and of all parties, and be the means of accomplishing great good to the Church. The liberal minded may make it the medium of communication, and thus all parties may in some degree be reached, and different portions of the Church learn to know each other better. It is a simple question, whether those who desire such a Review, and such a medium for the interchange of views, will unite in its support, and aid in its circulation.

With such views as to what may, and ought to be, accomplished, the position and aims of the Quarterly Review may be more distinctly stated.

1. It is designed to be a Review for *the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* By this, it is not meant that it will be narrow or exclusive, ignoring other Churches, or shutting them out from any place in its pages, but simply that it will be devoted to the interests of the Lutheran Church—and of the whole Lutheran Church. Other denominations have their Reviews, devoted chiefly, though not in any narrow sense, to their own interests. This is natural and proper. Our Review proposes to act on the same principle. Liberal and courteous towards all evangelical Churches, it will yet seek expressly to promote the welfare of the denomination whose name it bears.

There is not much in a name, and yet the name has been deliberately and purposely chosen with this view. Starting with the simple name, "*Evangelical Review*," and changed by Prof. Stoever in 1863, to that of "*Evangelical Quarterly Review*," it is now changed again, to express more definitely and fully its ecclesiastical connection and mission, into that of "QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH." Whilst not aiming to be less liberal than heretofore, it will not be ashamed of the name of *Lutheran*, and will be none the less respected, on that account, by other denominations.

It will seek to pursue the same liberal policy that characterized the Evangelical Review from the beginning. In its opening article that Review said, "We propose to give all parts of the Church an opportunity of exhibiting their sentiments." It reiterated the declaration, "We desire to cultivate a Lutheran Theology and Literature in the English Language, and the Review is open to all who can instruct and edify the public, for whom we labor, by articles of a suitable character in any department of our work. We know no sect or party in the Church. We give our own opinions in our contributions, and are willing that the representatives of every theological tendency in the Church, should do the same thing, provided, only, that they do it in a manner consistent with the character of such a work." All this is most cordially endorsed by the *Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, as it enters upon its work; and to avoid all misapprehension on this point, it wishes it to be distinctly understood, that its pages will be freely and fairly open to all portions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, that may be disposed or willing to accept the offer. If it is not a Review for the whole Lutheran Church in the United States, it will not be by any intentional fault of its own commission.

2. At the same time the position of the editors must be distinctly understood. They stand unequivocally on the basis of the General Synod. They could not do otherwise. Having spent their whole ministerial lives, thus far, in the General Synod, occupying positions of trust and responsibility in that relation, they would be recreant to plighted faith and duty, as well as to their deepest and most earnest convictions, if they were to profess or essay anything different. It would be a mistaken liberality for them to pretend to regard all distinctions in the Lutheran Church with indifference, or to be alike pleased with every phase of doctrine and practice. Whilst desiring to cherish and to exercise the broadest charity, they cannot, and would not, be understood as professing to yield their own convictions of truth and duty.

It is not supposed that any sacrifice on their part, were

such a thing possible, would secure the confidence and respect of those who may honestly differ from them. Honest and fair men know how to respect an honest difference of opinion, and will have more regard for those who openly and candidly avow it, than for those, who either have no opinions of their own, or lack the courage to make them known. The editors must, therefore, be fairly understood as occupying the stand-point of the General Synod, and so far as they may have occasion to give utterance to their views, will not hesitate to maintain their theological and ecclesiastical position. This they hope to do in a courteous and Christian manner, and giving equal privileges to those who may differ from them. This seems to be the only honorable and candid course.

3. But the position of the editors is not intended to interfere with the largest freedom of all parts of the Church. The Review will be open to all, not as a matter of courtesy, graciously extended, but as a right freely acknowledged. And it certainly need require no great stretch of condescension to accept this offer. Other Reviews have furnished examples of even wider liberality than is here proposed, and different denominations have united in making use of a common medium. The *Bibliotheca Sacra*, that prince of Theological Quarterlies, has been publishing a series of denominational articles, in which each denomination is allowed to speak for itself. If Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Reformed, and even Catholics, can speak through the same Journal, and be thus allowed to tell the world and each other what they believe and how they act, surely the different members of the same Lutheran household can speak through some common medium, as the *Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* The invitation to all is candid, frank, and cordial, and given without distinction as to Synodical or Theological peculiarities.

4. The editors of the Review do not regard it as their special mission to unite the diverse elements of the Lutheran

Church in the United States. But they do hope that it may serve in some sense as a bond of union, by bringing about a better understanding between different portions of the Church, smoothing down asperities in discussion, and gradually producing more harmony of feeling and unity of action. In accomplishing such a result free discussion is a most necessary part. No forced, or merely mechanical union can be of great advantage or long continuance. A union, to be genuine and lasting, must be the result of agreement in view and feeling, or a mutual understanding between the parties concerned.

Some are so eager, at times, for union, and so bitter with those who cannot fall in with their plans, that they are ready to decry and denounce them, and refuse to hold cordial fellowship with them, though of their own party. Such a zeal for union savors little of the charity "that never faileth," that "suffereth long and is kind," and which is the very "bond of perfectness." A "more excellent way," it is believed, would be a candid and full presentation of views, a calm discussion of the points about which there is difference of opinion, and the cultivation of friendly relations, until all come to see eye to eye, and can keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

It is very common just now to refer to the re-union of the Presbyterian Church, and point it out as an example of what Lutherans should do. But it is forgotten that there is a wide difference in the cases, and that the union referred to is between only two branches of the Presbyterian Church, leaving those who have that name almost, if not altogether, as much divided still, as the Lutheran Church is to-day. These two branches of the Presbyterian Church had no difficulties growing out of difference of language, section of the Union, mode of subscribing Confession, etc. They were essentially one, and the union was the more easily effected. And in this work of union, which is not depreciated, the Reviews of the Presbyterian Church performed an important part. They freely discussed the question, and prepared the way for the

happy consummation. May not the Quarterly Review do something for our Lutheran Church in the same direction?

5. The Review will aim to develop the theology and literature of the Church. In this country the Lutheran Church has done comparatively little to provide a literature for her children, and can boast of but few works that deserve, or hold, a prominent place in Theological Science. In the old world her achievements have eclipsed those of all other Churches. Germany, Protestant Germany, is in the van in nearly every department of theological study. The reasons for our being in the rear of other Churches in this country are obvious and need not be dwelt upon. But the time has fully come, when we should do something more to meet at least our own wants. By means of translations of the best works in German Theology, and of original productions, we must supply the needs of our own people. This must necessarily be a matter of time and of gradual development. We cannot expect at once to become a Church of distinguished writers and authors. Literature in any department is a matter of culture and growth.

By encouraging the disposition, and affording the opportunity, the Review will cultivate and improve the ability to write. Many, availing themselves of this medium, will be induced to write, who might otherwise never venture to appear before the public in print. The taste and habit will thus be formed and cherished, and cannot but tell upon our Church literature and our culture as a people. Many of the very best productions of the American press are contributions to the various Reviews. It is not intended that the Review shall furnish exercise for unfledged beginners, to try their powers, and prepare for greater achievements, but all who possess the ability and talent for writing to edification, are invited to contribute to its pages.

6. The interests of our Literary and Theological Institutions, of Beneficiary Education, Missions, and the work of practical Evangelization, will be urged in the Review. As a Church, we have a great work to do in this land. God has given us a wide field to cultivate. To do our work requires,

especially at this time, the better education of our people, the training of more young men to preach the Gospel, an enlarged spirit of benevolence, and increased activity in all the ways of a living and practical Christianity.

Doctrinal discussions may be needed. The morbid sensibility of many to all such discussions, is a sign of weakness, and not of strength, in Christian principle. But we need greater attention to matters of more pressing moment, and of greater practical importance. To cultivate the field God has given us, develop our resources, provide our people with the living ministry, build churches, establish Sunday Schools, publish and circulate a religious literature, turn the wilderness into a fruitful field, and make the waste places to bud and bloom, this is our great work, at this time, as a Church.

In seeking to further these ends, the Review will embrace a wide range of discussion. Anything bearing upon the interests of Religion, Morality, Science, Philosophy, Literature, Christian Civilization, or the general welfare of mankind, will come within its scope. Neither in the range of topics, nor in the length of discussion, is it intended to prescribe any narrow limits. Articles of any length, from four pages to the amplest allowable extent, will be admitted. A greater variety, in this respect, than is common in Theological Quarterlies, will be aimed at. Short articles, as well as more elaborate discussions, will be welcome. It is believed that a great majority of readers would prefer, intermingled with the thorough and exhaustive treatment of some topics, a greater number of short and more interesting articles, and the conviction of this preference will not be disregarded.

Enough has, perhaps, been said to indicate the position and aims of the Review. It is not the intention to weary with minute details, or to make extravagant promises that might not be fulfilled. Deeply conscious of the need of forbearance and charity on the part of our readers, confiding in an all-wise and over-ruling Providence, and hopeful of what may be accomplished by this instrumentality, we commend the Review to the generous support and efficient co-operation of all who love the Church, and to the favor of Him, whose blessing alone can insure true success and permanent good.

ARTICLE II.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

By Rev. C. A. Stork, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

The attention of the Church, in this country at least, has, within the last ten or twenty years, been specially turned to the matter of system in her benevolent contributions. The systematic methods introduced into the Church's collections in consequence of this concentration of attention have had something of the air of novelty. They certainly are novel as compared with the time-honored custom of the modern Church in this respect. Indeed, the movement has been met, at times, with a feeling in many minds that, like all novelties, it ought to be held at arms' length until well tried, and not embraced cordially and finally till justified by experience. The Church does wisely to be shy of new expedients and strange customs. She has found often in her history that the new way is not necessarily a better way.

But the element of system in obtaining benevolent contributions is nothing new. Paul's directions to the Church at Corinth and to the Churches of Galatia "concerning the collection for the saints," that "upon the first day of the week every one lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when he came," is about as pointed a rebuke as could be well put into words, of the method of raising money so long practiced in the modern, and more especially, in the American Churches. "No gatherings when I come," *i. e.*, no special collections: why not? What affecting stories might not the Apostle relate of the sufferings of the saints in Judea in the time of the famine; what

influence in the Apostle's presence; what a fervor of benevolence might be aroused; what tempests of sympathy; what floods of tenderness let loose; and then what a collection. Why no gatherings when he came? No, "let every one lay by him in store," in a systematic way, not under the pressure of special and exceptional excitements, but, "as God hath prospered him:" that is the Apostolic method. It is the method in substance that the ingenuity and practical enterprise of the age have devised and adapted to the needs of our modern Churches. But it is nothing new. It needs no period of probation to test it by the results of experience.

We are safe in following Paul in his expedients and methods, as well as in his doctrines and spirit. Still we may enforce his methods and show their consonance with the essential spirit of the Gospel he was sent to preach. There is a divine constitution of Christianity that we may call organic, wonderful in the symmetry and co-ordination of all its several members. Every part and parcel of the faith ever delivered to the saints, in its doctrines, graces, practice, is impressed with the same design. There are no duties or means of life added as after thoughts, or left remaining as merely temporary necessities, such as we see in the clumsy contrivances of men. All is profitable for life and for growth. The giving of the Church is to fall in with the harmony of the whole, and be, not merely a necessary means of support, a mere outward necessity, but co-ordinated as an essential function of life necessary to the perfection of the whole body. Paul calls it a grace: Synods and pastors of the modern Church seem to look upon it rather as a painful compulsion and bondage to be done away at last by the full emancipation of the millenial dawn.

We will take the liberty, on the authority of Paul, of assuming it to be a grace, and discuss its exercise and development as such.

Two great lines of motive to its cultivation open a way for us into the heart of the subject. In one direction we see the great needs of the Church and of the world calling for help. In another we see the life of the individual believer and the

training of the Church into Christian perfection demanding the exercise of this special grace. The Christian must give, to carry out the plan of his Master in the extension of his kingdom throughout the world. He must give, or the kingdom of Christ will crumble in his own soul. Let us follow these two lines of motive.

What is the best method of giving for supporting the external machinery of the Church in her aggressive work? The method of common practice hitherto has been that of special appeal for special objects as the urgency of any pressing wants has been pungently felt. The method has been that of almsgiving to clamorous beggars. A ragged, squalid, woe-begone creature tells his pitiful tale, and the sympathy of the moment extorts the rash gift repented of almost as soon as given. A cause of christian enterprise in debt, crippled, shorn of strength, comes to our church door with its sorrowful, stirring tale and we give as to the beggar at our house door, with mingled feelings of sympathy, irritation at the importunity, and a secret self-complacency at our own generosity.

Every such appeal and answer is disastrous in a two-fold way: it squanders the opportunity and it dries up the fountain of benevolence from which future supplies must flow. In every such special appeal, the harvest is gathered always from the few. Worse than that, the few who give are confirmed in an unhealthy exercise of duty: they are taught to give spasmodically, and, therefore, feebly; for all spasmodic, fitful action is in the end feeble and exhaustive. The Church is impoverished by their wasteful and unhealthy method.

A scheme of Systematic Benevolence anticipates the wants of the Church in her several operations and prepares to meet them. It does not wait to be spurred by sympathetic appeals, or mechanically jogged by the day of stated collection. It says to *all* the membership "give." Whatever the specific scheme adopted, an essential part of that scheme is that each must contribute, and contribute deliberately and regularly. Two elements of success are thus secured:

1. *The Church levies her revenue on all her population.* The experience of all taxation in all governments is that large

revenues can be secured only by imposts and duties that reach all. The wealth of the Church as of the State is not in the hands of the few but of the many. The revenues of government come at last from the masses of the people; not from the millionaires, but from those of moderate means. The farcical experiment of paying the war debt by the voluntary contributions of the rich, that filled the papers and the public ear a few years ago and then exploded into mist, ought to be a lesson to the Church that expects to provide for the Lord's treasury out of the coffers of her rich members. A scheme of benevolence systematic enough to include all the membership of the Church is the only hope of securing the means of extension. The dimes of the poor when all collected will be more than the dollars of the rich.

2. *The Church secures more from each that gives systematically.* One law runs through all life and nature: what is to be done largely must be done gradually and regularly. When the experiment on the war debt was tried, Mr. Stewart astounded the country by his offer of millions; but Mr. Stewart's income tax by the time the income tax is repealed, will be ten times the amount of his proffered gift. Mr. Stewart was a shrewd man. He who lays by him in store every first day in the week, or first day in the month, as God hath prospered him, will inevitably give more in the run of five or ten years than any amount of special pressure, personal pleading and sympathetic pumping, on the spur of the moment, can wring out of him.

3. *The capacity for benevolence in each soul is enlarged.* It is a poor farmer that tills his land only for the next harvest. Much of our benevolent operation is of that sort: we kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Every healthy contribution ought to make the next giving easier and larger. It does. A systematic, deliberate giving leaves the soul unstrained and sweet. There is wisdom in the Apostle's words, "God loveth a cheerful giver:" a cheerful giver not only performs his actual gift with the love that goes with it, but he will give again, and again. The giver who has been warmed with eloquence, and poisoned with bad emulation, and cajoled with

flattery, and shamed by publicity, and stimulated by large doses of sympathy, like a man after a strong purgative dose, is very hard to move the next time. The stimulus of thought and principle and regularity in giving, is a stimulus that enlarges the capacity of benevolence in a soul perpetually. Merely, then, financially it is better in the long run for a man to give ten cents a week regularly to the the cause of Christ, than once a year to be pumped, and entreated, and dragooned into giving ten dollars. There is danger that your spasmodic spring will run totally dry.

But there is another avenue of approach to this subject. It is a way too little trodden. I am afraid that it is a way that practically we do not much believe in. It is through our Lord's maxim, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Giving as a means of grace and exercise of holiness to the soul, is disproportionately neglected in our teaching as ministers. It is a wrong to a man's soul that he is allowed through any timidity or soft leniency on the part of his pastor, to slip by the duty of giving systematically. We have seen what Systematic Benevolence will do for the treasury of the Church; let us look at what it can effect for the members of the Church.

As our contributions, collections and benevolent operations are generally conducted, giving is often a real hindrance and source of evil to the members. It hurts a man's soul to wheedle him into giving, or to shame him into giving, or to excite him into giving; but is it not true that much of the giving in our Churches is so effected? It is good to give: but it is not good to give from bad motives. The recoil on the soul is dangerous. Better never to give than after the gift to regret, and grow angry at your rashness, or to carry away the proud self-complacence of the Pharisee, who congratulated himself and his Maker that he paid tithes of all that he possessed.

Now a Systematic Benevolence implies thought. By its very regularity and deliberation it takes the act of giving out of the domain of excited feelings and passion. It makes

the whole man give; his conscience, will and reason work together in the cool, healthy atmosphere of principle and conscious consecration to God. Giving so practiced is a deep fountain of blessing to the soul. It is Christ-like. Consider what it secures in the spiritual experience:

1. *It makes the benevolent spirit habitual.* Goodness does not consist in flashes of impulse, struck out of a soul, like sparks out of flint and steel by sharp concussion and pungent strokes from without. It is a life, a fountain of life welling up in the soul. Unselfishness, the Christ-like temper, does not come by pathetic stories, sights of misery moving the sympathies, but by seriously providing to remove that misery. A man has some benevolence when he wipes his eyes after a tale of distress and pulls out his purse; but that wears out after awhile. Besides it is too infrequent, too impulsive, too much of an external show. But to think of others, to put by habitually, to sacrifice, to give deliberately week after week for others—that is to grow into the principle, the very life of Christ. It is slow, but it is sure. It affords to the soul, what our daily walking and working furnish to the body, the means of growing into strength and use.

2. *It teaches self-denial and fore-thought in the exercise of religion.* It is no cross-bearing to be borne away in the tide of a general sympathy, to indulge the strong sense of sympathy at the pungent prick of pathos, to let loose our sensibilities in the impulse of giving. It is only a higher kind of self-indulgence. The tide of sympathetic feeling ebbs, the tears dry up, the vivid picture of need fades out; then come the after thought, the regret, and the revulsion. In reality it has cost the man nothing that he indulged his spasmodic impulse. He has known the dangerous luxury of indulging feeling, not the sweetness of sacrifice and self-denial for the sake of love. He looks back on his gift as the cost of a high spiritual excitement. He has been excited, not developed. Now consider the process of a systematic giving. First is thought: almost anything is good that will bring thought. Then are educed knowledge, deliberation, the exercise of looking at the needs of others. These are all wholesome. Then comes

the counting of the cost: this comes inevitably in the coolness of the deliberate act; then the decision, the assumption deliberately of the sacrifice, the giving up of so much. It is an act of spiritual effort, a motion after the footsteps of Christ. Now this is done again and again. as the time recurs. It is true spiritual exercise. The power of it is, that it is a real act done for Christ. Most giving, done without system, is not an act of the man himself. He is plead with, pushed at, wrought upon by pride, shame, emulation, sympathy, and his act is no real spiritual exertion, but something put upon him. It is a good deal to get a man to put out his withered hand. He does it at every giving done systematically.

3. *It kills the sense of patronage and self-complacence that commonly infests the giving of the Church.* We destroy all the blessedness of giving, to the mass of believers, when we make them feel, or allow them to feel that Christ, or his Church come to them as beggars. Of course if the occasion, and the specially affecting and effective circumstances of the particular case are to be the means of getting the money out of the people, then the most must be made of these. As beggars whine and show their rags and sores to excite sympathy, so must the particular need make its pathetic impression; the pleader is compelled to be the suppliant; he must humble himself, and exalt those he petitions and cajoles. Now, the petitioned and wrought upon man will, of course, feel the greatness of his condescension. When he gives, it will seem to him naturally a great goodness and high merit. The special, overstrained plea almost compels the liberal man to take the Pharisee's place. This is a degradation to Christ. It is a humiliation to his Church. It is a grevious wrong that the giver's gift should return upon himself only in an access of pride, and make him think more highly of himself than he ought to think.

But we drop this system, or, rather, let us call it no-system. We expound the duty and privilege of giving. We lay the facts before the people. We lead them to thought.

We leave them to make the decision deliberately. The ever-recurring laying-by, the necessary thought, the deliberation, the exercise of the self-denial—these take the whole thing out of the range of personal influence; it is not the agent, the minister, the society that are put under obligation; it is Christ and his kingdom that are present to the man. Whoever has attended a church-consecration, a benevolent society anniversary, and calls to mind the humiliating scenes so often enacted on such occasions—humiliating alike to Christ and to his people—will feel that to put such things forever away from the sight of our children and young brethren, is in itself a great gain to the dignity and purity of the Church. It ennobles men to act from principle, and the man who gives systematically and deliberately, has the benefit of such ennobling. It tends to degrade and enfeeble to play the part of condescending benefactor, and it is that part that too often, under the special-occasion scheme of benevolence, the Christian giver has been called to play.

It is not within the scope of this paper to point out any specific method of application of the general principles set forth and defended. It is enough if the attention of the readers of the Review be directed to the importance of this whole subject, and if any attempt to carry out the principle herein set forth be occasioned in the practice of any.

Let it suffice in conclusion to point out what may be called the essential practical features of any true systematic plan of benevolence, such as shall effect the results designated in the preceding discussion as the proper outcome of a true exercise of this grace:

1. The regular instruction of the people in the true nature and practice of this grace.

2. The deliberate appropriation of some sufficient part of the believer's possessions to the work of the Church.

3. The regular recurrence of this appropriation, whether it be weekly, monthly—by subscription, collection, at home or in the church.

The distinctive qualities of systematic benovelence, those that make it efficient financially and as a spiritual discipline,

viz.: knowledge, deliberation, forethought, self-denial, regularity in practice, are distinguished from the contrasted features of what we may call the hap-hazard scheme of benevolence, viz.: feeling, impulse, rashness, indulgence of sensibility, spasmodic efforts.

ARTICLE III.

THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY, ESPECIALLY IN GERMANY: DR. DORNER'S INTRODUCTION TO HIS HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY.

Translated by S. Sprecher, D. D , President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

A history of Protestant theology in Germany pre-supposes that Protestantism is a quantity having, in some way, inherent unity; and that it is not held together merely by the uniformity of the place of its exhibition. Otherwise we could not, with propriety, attempt a life-history of it. Nor could our undertaking be justified, if it were, as many think, only a phenomenon of something else,—only, for example, the negative side of Roman Catholicism, and thus for its own being, always pre-suppssing the existence of that against which it contended. It is not simply a protest, ordained by a higher hand, to accompany the Romish Church, for effectual warning, or purification, or even for chastisement. It has its own inherent principle of life. It is a peculiar Christian formation, distinct from the Romish and Greek Catholic Churches, as also from the sects. The point of investigation, here, is not whether it and Roman Catholicism differ from each other, as kinds or stages, in the apprehension of Christianity. In the former case, the difference would lead us back to a variety of religious individuality, which, whether it appear in national grouping, or in single individuals, has an

inner right to self-preservation and continuance. In the latter case, the higher stage would have to preserve, fully, the good of the lower, as, on the other hand, the lower would generally be obliged to pass over into the higher. Perhaps, neither of the two is exactly the case; perhaps, Protestantism, though conscious of representing a higher stage of the religious spirit, has, nevertheless, only a partial right to be regarded as its completeness; inasmuch as though a higher stage, and, consequently, one for which all Christendom should strive, it yet represents it in an individual way, so that, perhaps, upon the same stage, other froms of the Christian spirit may be developed,—Christian qualities, which now hid, perhaps, under masses of dross in other Churches, may, one day, break forth, when that which perverts shall have been removed, and the evangelical stage of life attained. And this will then, also, be for the benefit of the Protestant Church, which now, indeed, is preserved from certain dangers by Roman Catholicism as a warning example, but which is also easily, though unwillingly driven into a certain one-sidedness. Yea, by the presence of the Roman Catholic Church, within whose sphere it must dread, in any way, to come, it is hindered in free development from itself; that is, in relation to the positive in Christianty, or that side of it, which is supposed to lie nearest to Catholism. Amid such various indivualities of the evangelical stage, we can scarcely speak of a plurality of evangelical churches; for each healthy individuality stands, not in a relation of exclusiveness toward others, so far as their true nature is concerned, but in a position of recognition and love, that is, of giving and taking; in one word, in the relation of a member to the whole and to the other parts.

Protestantism does, indeed, seek its final establishment in the nature of Christianity as it has been authentically transmitted to us in the Sacred Scriptures. But it dare not withdraw itself from the task of justifying *historically* its separate existence and peculiar nature; that is, to show, in historical view, that the necessity of its appearance, in a negative and positive relation, had come, that it appeared in the full-

ness of time, and that it still maintains an indispensable position in Christendom.

That Protestantism is not a chaos of tendencies, of every possible kind; not a confused mass of accidental opinion, dependent upon the position against which it is constantly protesting, but that it is, on the other hand, notwithstanding its numerous inner differences, conceivable as a quantity possessed of inner unity, and capable of being reduced to a single principle; this can only, indeed, first fully appear from an historical exhibition of Protestant theology. Preliminarily it may suffice to call to mind that the name Protestantism has, in the European family of nations, since the sixteenth century, designated the entire descent of the Reformation, and that it embraces all those who are rooted in the soil of the Reformation. More immediately, indeed, the Protestants have derived their name from that Diet at Spires (1529), where (against the evangelical princes who had, upon the ground of rights established by earlier Diets, begun to carry on the work of reformation, according to the Word of God, in their countries) a counter-reformation was designed to be introduced by the majority of the princes under the patronage of the emperor. Against this attempt, the evangelical princes based the justification of their cause upon the good ground of their German and Christian rights and duties, not upon the basis of anarchical arbitariness or lust of license. They wished to protect evangelical freedom, to allow no human mediation to separate between believers and Christ; but they wished also to have freedom bound by evangelical truth and love, and by the regulations which flow from them. Those who thus stood and spoke at Spires, were denominated protesting or protestant princes of the empire. And from this point where the Reformation, for the first time, stood forth as a self-conscious and compact historical phenomenon (as in the year after, at Augsburg, it attained to a definite and comprehensive confession before the emperor and the empire—a confession conservative of the whole of the common Christianity) did this name go out over the protestant countries where it dropped its relations to the German

civil matters, but retained the genuine spirit of the free, open attestation of scriptural, evangelical truth against its perversions. Therefore, we must not permit ourselves to be deprived of, or disgusted with this name of honor which our fore-fathers have gained and borne with martyr-courage; inasmuch as it is only necessary to maintain it in its historical significance, in order to see that this protest against wrong and error had its root and power in the positive truth, and in the augmentation of the kingdom of God, and thereby also in the well-being of the fatherland.

The great Reformation-work—whose fruit is the historical quantity designated by the name of Protestantism, the formation of an evangelical Christendom or ecclesiastical association along-side of the Greek and Roman Catholicism—did now, indeed, come forth, in many acts; but it still had its unity, not simply through the essential coetaneousness and affinity of the nations which constituted the theatre of it. Nor was this unity produced merely by the guiding and exemplary position of one country, or one person.

Eminent as was the position of Germany, Wittenberg, Luther, Calvin, yet essentially similar, inner motives and impulses guided the reform-movement in many countries of Christian Europe—motives and impulses which were, notwithstanding, in a great measure, independent of each other. It is not the work of single individuals. The most influential reformers desired only to be organs for the work of God in their appointed place, and they were elevated without any plans of reform, by faithfulness in little things, almost against their will, and always against their expectations, to the most far-reaching thoughts of reform. It was one universal, divine thought which was to be carried out far beyond the thoughts of men. The Christian Church was to ascend to a new stage in the appropriation of salvation, and the development of Christianity. This one divine thought is, therefore, notwithstanding the manifold differences and divisions in Protestantism, the power which holds together all those who are truly incorporated with the great reform-movement of the sixteenth century. It causes them to constitute, in the midst

of the rest of Christendom, a family of like type, whose ancestral seat is the German people.

Protestantism does, indeed, by this confess itself, beforehand, as a special, particular phenomenon within the mass of Christendom. But though, thus far, it has been especially the Germanic race, with its various nations, to which was entrusted the task of the Reformation, and the world-historical labor which is to make its work continue and bear fruit, yet it does, by no means, follow from this that it confesses itself as simply a many-limbed part of the Church, a fragment of Christian truth, or that it must, or would exclude from itself any one thing, which can maintain itself as truly Christian. It desires the entire Christian truth, even though it may have succeeded as little as any other in the course of history, in the perfect appropriation of it. But what it would represent, as its already attained profession, is a new aspect of the entire Christian truth, a more perfect appropriation of it, in thinking, feeling and willing, namely, the *personal* appropriation of the truth, having discovered that Christianity, according to its innermost tendency, is chiefly concerned with this. Its particular appearance is not the result of choice. This has been thrust upon it from without, nor does its removal depend entirely upon itself. It must, therefore, notwithstanding this, claim that the essence of that which it represents, is designed for all, and that all are designed for it: for this essence which is common in Christianity (which enjoys also outward universality or catholicity) it has, in *personal* application and direction. And thus, though it does not yet enjoy, it really has an inner right to universal recognition in Christendom, and possesses, by this, at least, an inner catholicity. However much of the transient may yet attach to its appearance, the evangelical stage, which constitutes its essence, Protestantism must maintain, as the universal aim, as the common Christian task, if it would not abandon itself. In comparison with the other two great Church-parties of Christendom, Protestantism will be satisfied, neither

with a mere intellectual appropriation of Christianity, whether it be by the speculative faculty, or the power of memory, or in the form of an inherited doctrine, nor simply with a subjection of the will to a dogmatic, or even practical ecclesiastical law. To it, Christianity is power, light and life, which is to be appropriated and wrought out by the totality of the person, in a believing mind. And it lives in the confidence, that by this, the Church of Christ has begun to attain that higher stage, which, in a normal way, had to be introduced. It consequently cannot properly be called the cause of the Occidental church-division. As the higher stage is higher only in so far as it has, within itself, room for that which is true and sound in the earlier stages; and, as the earlier stages, have in them the germs, which in it grow to unfolding, the earlier stage cannot exclude itself from the essence of Protestantism without wronging itself and injuring the germs of its own future.

It cannot be the task of science, and would but little accord with the dignity of history, to subserve confessional pride and human ambition. But it is eminently proper to preserve a lively and grateful consciousness of God's acts toward our people, in order that we may become the more willing and skillful instruments, for the designs of God, with our evangelical Church, in reference to entire Christendom on earth. The countries of the Reformation are the theater of the greatest work of God, which, since the days of the Apostles, has transpired in the innermost domain of the spirit, and of religion. It is a work upon the blessed fruits of which many generations and nations have feasted. Especially was our German fatherland the foremost place of this divine work, and the Reformation, with its salutary, enlivening and conservative powers, has become a benefit to the whole people, even to that part, which has thus far, stood in a relation of opposition, seeking to enjoy the fruits, without adopting the tree which bears them.

The new light, which in the sixteenth century arose, in harmony with primitive Christianity, upon the way to the true peace and salvation of the soul, cast its rays, in an un-

expected way, upon all Christian doctrines, and unlocked an entire new world of ideas and knowledges; but, at the same time, it originated, also, an entire range of new problems, which had their unity in this, that it was necessary, from the newly-gained stand-point, to lay hold of things everywhere in their central point, and, in thinking as in acting, to place them in the light of one great system. For every more deeply penetrating movement of spirits shortens the distance between outwardly separated spheres, and brings to light the inner connection—the unity in their root—of otherwise disconnected things. It could not but happen that, very often, the solution of these problems, extending as they did, to the entire mass of the moral, religious, theoretical and practical life of the individual and of society, of heaven and earth, would terminate very differently and antagonistically, and this has presented, to shallow reflection, the suspicion that the effect of Protestantism was chaos and dissolution of all unity. But, wherever the Protestant principle yet remained and operated, "there the impinging of the spirits upon one another," and the breaking of insufficient forms, by the blows of the contest, tended to bring to light that precious, pure gold of truth, which is richly adapted to the whole. Where, however, men broke with the Protestant principle, and availed themselves only of the formal liberation of spirits through the Reformation, there, indeed, is no longer a life-history of the Protestant Church and theology to be seen, but only a history of its sufferings. For the Protestant Church is as little responsible as is the Romish Church, yea, less responsible than it, for the appearance of Voltairianism, or for that of the degenerate Humanism of Italy. But, in the end, even those phenomena, which cannot be regarded as positive forces or developments of the principle, and which do not operate in the way of purification, must yet stand, as great doctrinal monuments, and exhibit the *final impractibility* of the erroneous ways which depart from evangelical truth.

But it is impossible to set in correct light the historical movement of evangelical theology, or to understand it, in its outgoing and end, unless we have gained, first of all, an im-

age, true to life, of the Reformation and its struggle. For that which the creative period of the Reformation, with original power, exhibited more in fundamental thoughts, clear and ripe, than in development, completed and provided,—for that the seventeenth century brings the enclosure, and the formal, logical analysis, but the eighteenth, the negative, critical solution, while the nineteenth, more conscious than any preceding time, of things in their principle, is exerting itself to master the principle, in its fruitfulness and power, and to carry forward the analysis to synthesis in a new and higher form.

We will, therefore, by way of introduction, contemplate, first of all, the hidden work of the preparation of the way of the Reformation, and, therein, seek out the silent, constructing hand, which in divine reticence, as yet held secret what it designed to do, until after the most manifold processes of purifyings, separations and assimilations, the reformatory principle was inwardly ripened, and now, with victorious power burst its teguments. We shall see how then the purifying fountains which were collecting, in all places, here and there, but especially from the salutary spring at Wittenberg, mightily streamed forth, in order to pour a new life over Germany, yea, over a great part of Christian humanity. There is not merely something remarkable, but something typical, and worthy of imitation, in the way and manner, in which the reformatory principle prepared its place in the souls of the reformers, gradually overpowering them and qualifying them to be its bearers and defenders. How they, in the beginning, did not suspect its boundless content, much less hold themselves worthy to have such great things wrought through them, but how also their godly, believing mind became strong through the acknowledged and apprehended truth, and their humility, at first timid, yea, trembling, culminated in that manly courage which forgets itself and its own weakness, in the cause of God, and wishes to sacrifice itself to it. We do not forget, that no single man, no single nation entirely clothes itself with Christianity; that much more everything, individual and national, is sub-

jeet to a certain one-sidedness. But it is not, therefore, the less proper to esteem highly the common inheritance of the evangelical Church of the Reformation-period, that which our forefathers desired, did and suffered, in order to gain what they regarded as the treasure of their hearts and the refuge of the German nation as well as of their posterity, constantly to refresh the consciousness of their worthiness, to preserve the good acquired by them, the inexpressibly precious good which the Greek and Roman confession dispenses with, but needs, faithfully to preserve it in true remembrance for ourselves, and thereby, also, to guard it for all Christendom.

Evangelical truth is, however, not a dead treasure, but a living fructifying principle. This is manifest, also, upon the whole, from the confession and effort of the evangelical Church, in its history of more than three hundred years. It will be our duty, in the following books, to exhibit this fruitfulness of the Protestant principle, and its extension to the various spheres of life, in labor and contest, in order, that we may gain a clear view of the riches of Christianity which are exhibited upon the evangelical stage of its appropriation. Outside of Germany, especially, the Reformed countries have, upon the whole, thus far, sought to set forth the Protestant principle more according to its realistic side—that of practical ethical life: Germany has, thus far, grasped more the ideal side of Protestantism, and, in addition to Cultus, has exhibited the Protestant world-view, more speculatively, scientifically. It may be owing to this, that Protestantism, as a religious principle, has also, here, appeared more deeply and purely as a religious world-moving power, and that it has, here, brought true *freedom* and *authority*, more thoroughly, to *religious union*. Moreover, as the inner world of the spirit has, here, more independently and richly developed itself, this is the seal of *Protestant theology*, and has been, with constantly increasing preponderance, down to the very latest times. There is, indeed, no branch of the Protestant—joint Church—among the various nations, this side and beyond the Channel and the Belts, yea, even the Atlantic ocean,—which must not acknowledge that the power of scientific Protestantism, in ex-

egetical, historical systematic theology, has its seal in Germany. But, while we are conscious that this gift is charateristic of the German spirit, that the history of German Protestant theology has, upon the whole, more universal significance for Protestantism, it becomes us to connect with this the acknowledgment of our weakness and deficiency, in comparison with other countries, so far as the operation of the practical, ethical power of the Protestant principle is concerned, a want and an imperfection which are not entirely removed even by that ethical, religious tendency which pervades the modern theology, by which it has been led to acknowledge this want, as also to find the inner transition, from the life of thought to the entire world of practice. All the excellencies and advantages, rooted in the evangelical principle, and exhibited in the various territories of Evangelical Christianity, are calculated, from their peculiar foundations, for exchange and appropriation, and must, therefore, be the subjects of mutual contemplation. But this contemplation passes beyond the limits of our task, which is the history, not of the Protestant Church, but of its theology.

On the other hand, the evangelical party are bound to exhibit the proof of this claim which we have above, in general, indicated. It will contribute, essentially, to the clearness and certainty of the religious and ecclesiastical, as well as the theological self-consciousness of evangelical Christians, if it shall be, historically, shown, that Protestantism, as an animated, comprehensive quantity, is, in reference to its origin and progress, a well justified, Christian, and *historically* established phenomenon, maintaining itself in good Christian conscience; that it has, further, thus far, in the midst of all its movements and its antagonisms, still preserved the continuity of an historical and growing quantity; that it has, finally, its own clearly ascertainable tasks and objects which, originally, were committed only to it, but which it has not for itself alone, but also for entire Christendom.

* * * * * * *

One difficulty in the way of exhibiting Protestant theology according to the above-mentioned compass, as a united quantity, is the difference of the two evangelical confessions which

have gained footing also in Germany. If we look at the matter in the general, and in Germany more particularly, where it must be contemplated aside from the Grecian Orient, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism are so divided, in Europe and America, that Protestantism, in general, occupies the North of Europe, and America, likewise, also, the North of Germany, but Romanism the South. The difference between the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions, on the other hand, makes a cross division. We see, upon the theatre of the general evangelical Church, a preponderance of the Reformed in the West, from Scotland, England, Holland and France to Switzerland, and a preponderance of the Lutheran in the East; from the South, in Wurtemberg and Bavaria, through middle and North Germany, to Denmark, Sweden, Norway and the Russian Baltic provinces. To the Reformed West belongs also, with overwhelming preponderance, North America. Among the two principal Protestant groups, there are also uniting members of various kinds; outside of Germany, in Hungary, where the two evangelical Confessions possess about equal weight, as also in Alsace. Moreover, the Reformed Switzerland, through nationality and intercourse, on the one hand, and the Anglican Church, through its manifold Lutheranizing method, on the other, form an inner bond between the two evangelical Confessions. But most of all are there such uniting members between the two Churches in Germany; thus Wurtemberg, from the Lutheran side, while the Reformed Church exists almost everywhere in Germany, with moderate feelings and inner friendliness to the Lutheran Confession; so, in Baden and the Palatinate; so, in Hessia and the Rhine countries; so, in Westphalia and East Friesland.

This state of things makes it possible, in the midst of due attention to its reciprocal relations to foreign countries, to present the history of Protestant theology in Germany in one view. The nations and races which have adopted the Reformation, especially in Germany, even where at a later day, they separated into two Confessions, and led a special life, yet bear, in consequence of the common point of departure of the one great Reform-movement, a certain family

type of a negative and positive kind, and have among them one rich, common endowment, in virtue of which the great Reform-work was in general effected. Consequently in the beginning, they appeared to themselves and to others, as one Church-party. It may be granted, that the differences, which afterwards distinctly and divisively appeared, were already germinally present from the beginning. But it is equally true, that the Lutheran and Reformed Confessions may be regarded as varied exhibitions of one and the same Protestant principle; exhibitions in which it has begun to work out its power and fulness, and from which, when brought to interchange, it will derive great benefit for the whole. To this must be added, that even during their separate life, when the evangelical Confessions were accustomed to proceed in parallel lines, beside each other, they did yet, in the difficult points of their development, and in proportion to the importance of these, very clearly betray their inner relation to each other, as one family type, whether it was more, in the form of opposition and antagonism, or more, in the way of harmony, and in the spirit of attempted understanding of each other.

Still another difficulty in our undertaking arises, from the relation of theology to the Church. There can be no history, unless there be, upon the whole, not simply movement, but movement which produces that which is new—an advance—and which, at the same time, is a development of that primitive germ, in which the original power of the matter was inclosed. But now it may be said, that the ecclesiastical doctrinal conception was already established and defined in 1530, 1580 and 1619; that, to the results of later theological labor, whatever excellencies they may contain, there has come no ecclesiastical sanctions; yea, that even the very forms, by which the old Church gave such sanctions, and by setting line-stones, secured the attained advancement of the common ecclesiastical conviction, are, for the most part, wanting in the evangelical Church. In addition to this, the later theological movements, especially from the eighteenth century onward, depart so widely from each other, as to make it difficult to hold fast the thread of ecclesiastical development.

But the proof that the thread has never been broken must be possible. How could the fact otherwise be explained, that the evangelical Church of the nineteenth century is, again, so vividly conscious of its connection with the Reformation, not only where there is attempted an artificial, yea, we might say, an improvisate, retrogressive movement to the Reformation period, but, also where the never-dead but newly revived recollection has again inwardly and firmly united the spirit, organically and vitally, with the Reformation?

It will be necessary, therefore, to cognize the connection, which even the eighteenth century unconsciously had, in various ways, with the Reformation period, and to incorporate it into the whole of the history of the Protestant theology. But, then, no councils nor formal positive ecclesiastical definition of the dogma will be necessary, in order to speak of the development of the doctrinal conception. The first three hundred years of the Christian Church (to which the first three of the Protestant Church have so much resemblance) prove the contrary of this, for, then, without œcumenical synods, the dogmatic progress was, for hundreds of years, as rapid as it was secure and continuous. Nowhere was the dogma made, or even acknowledged as truth, through the force of ecclesiastical sanction, in juridical, ecclesiastically justified form; but, on the contrary, it fixed itself in the common faith, by the power of its own content. Even now the sanctioning establishment professes to add nothing to the truth, but to seek only to secure its value by the form of outward authority. But it is precisely this last, which has little importance for the evangelical Church, as it acknowledges no infallibility of ecclesiastical authority. If the attained advancement seems to be less securely established for it, there is the more free, actual appropriation of the truth, which, wherever it has free play, as in the evangelical Church, will show its power to mold and bind the spirit by its inner authority, without, in addition to the truth, chaining it also to apparent, but erroneous progress, and making the missteps of the past a binding inheritance, a sacred inherited evil, without *beneficium inventarii.*

We cannot, therefore, adduce any declaration of an ecclesiastical tribunal for that which has been attained since the days of symbolical definition, much less can we adduce this, as a proof of it. But these outward proofs of evangelical truth are as unnecessary as they are unattainable. We do not despise outward authorities, but everything depends upon this, that we apprehend, clearly and firmly, the Protestant principle in its purity, and handle it as the determining, judging, and relatively, also, as the excluding and refuting principle.

Finally, in order that the view may not be disturbed and perverted by the rich materials of the individual sciences of Protestant theology and their productions, it will be necessary, so to relate the life-history of Protestant theology, that it may be, at the same time and above all, the history of the Protestant principle.

ARTICLE IV.

SOCRATES AND ARNOLD OR THE ANCIENT AND MODERN TEACHER.

By Rev. T. H. Robinson, D. D., Harrisburg, Pa.

Our subject calls for facts rather than for personal opinions; the writer may, therefore, conceal himself behind the personages whom he presents.

Socrates and Arnold! We shall not compare the men, for, high as the latter stands in his sphere as an educator, it is confessed by all, that, taking the full measure of the men, the ancient towers far above the modern.

Socrates was one of those few men of genius, so largely endowed with all the properties of a great manhood, that they can do almost anything, and do it well. They are the masters of all trades. Everything about him is remarkable, personal appearance, moral physiognomy, position, aims,

method, life and death. So grandly did nature pour forth her treasure upon him, that there were in him materials enough to form several uncommon men, all of whom should be head and shoulders above the generation. The greatest of his successors down to the present age, have been proud to call him master, and happy to tread in his footsteps. As the myriad-minded Shakespeare finds his admirers in every age, and his pupils among all people, the transcendental German, the versatile French, and the practical common-sense of his own English-speaking race, so Socrates commends himself to every class of minds.

He was born B. C. 469, the son of Sophroniscus and Phaenarete, poor parents from whom he received but an ordinary education. His father was a sculptor, and, entering early his father's shop, he, too, learned the art, and is said to have become a workman of taste and skill. A group of Graces was exhibited for centuries at the Acropolis, which tradition attributed to his chisel. He, however, early relinquished the art and became a soldier, performing military service in three battles, and distinguishing himself in each. He surpassed most men in courage, physical endurance and the virtues of the camp and the field. Various anecdotes are related concerning his conduct during these campaigns. "On one occasion," Plato tells us, "he stood before the camp for four and twenty hours, on the same spot, wrapt in meditation, and, as he seemed not to be able to unravel the subject of his thought, he stood as if inquiring and discussing within himself." He was, in his physical parts, a full-grown, complete man, a man, according to the testimony of his companions, quite prodigious and almost superhuman.

Plato says of him: "We were fellow-soldiers and had our mess together. Socrates overcame not only me, but every one beside in the endurance of toils. None could sustain hunger like him. He alone seemed to enjoy our military fare, when we had plenty. No person ever saw him drunk. In the depth of an excessively rigid winter, he sustained, calmly, incredible hardships, and while none went out of their tents, or, if they went out, wrapt themselves up carefully and put fleeces under their feet, and bound their legs with

hairy skins, Socrates went out only with the same cloak on that he usually wore, and walked barefoot upon the ice, more easily than those who had sandalled themselves so delicately."

His bravery in battle is a theme for Plato's highest eulogy. In bodily constitution, in natural temperament, in physical strength and courage, nor less in moral courage and in mental powers and attainments, he seems to have been as near the standard of human perfection as any one of his race has ever attained. He was three-score years and ten before his unwearied frame gave way.

He did not become a teacher until after had passed middle life. Of the few events left on record, which filled up his life prior to that time, one was his marriage with Xantippe, who is represented by many of the ancient writers as a perfect termagant, and whose name, in modern times, is synonymous with shrew. It may be that the infirmities of this good woman have been greatly exaggerated, as well as the domestic squabbles, between herself and her lord. Yet the violence of her temper and the calmness of his, have become proverbial. He gives a playful explanation of his reason for the choice of such a woman, by saying, "Those who wish to become skilled in horsemanship select the most spirited horses; after being able to bridle those, they believe they can bridle all others. Now as it is my wish to live and converse with men, I married this woman, being firmly convinced that, in case I should be able to endure her, I should be able to endure all others."

To know the man more fully, we must cast a glance at his public career. He shunned office among his fellow-men. In fact he was almost always in the minority, that is the opposition. He was an Aristocrat when the Ultra Democracy ruled, and sought, regardless of justice, to level all things. He was a Democrat, when the Aristocracy of the Thirty Tyrants filled Athens with the victims of oppression. He was a Conservative, when demagogues ruled. He was a Liberal, when law was made an instrument of injustice. He was a true "Higher-law" man, proclaiming, unceasingly, the supremacy of justice and a brave, unflinching adherence to it, as both the highest virtue and the highest happiness of a

people. When, in private life, he refused to return a fugitive into slavery, and when he was elected to the Senate, he was not popular, because statesmanship, in his eyes, was to administer equal and impartial justice to all men, at all hazards. His bravery as a Senator, even surpassed his bravery as a soldier, for he had the high moral courage which could brave not only death, but opinion. He could defy a tyrant, and he could as calmly defy a tyrannical mob. No clamors, no imperiousness of one, or of many, could move him to do a wrong. He says of himself, at a critical period, "The Government, although it was so powerful, did not frighten me into doing anything unjust."

He was no trained, public orator, yet he was admitted to be equal to the most powerful orators of his day in the mastery of audiences. When on trial for his life he declined to use the oration which the celebrated Lysias had prepared for him. His judges refused to let Plato speak in his behalf, and then he, without any premeditation, stood up, unmoved, unabashed, and made one of the most sublime utterances that ever fell from human lips. It hastened his martyrdom, but it secured for him an immortality among men.

But his great vocation was that of a teacher, and to this we turn. This, he said to the judges who condemned him to drink the fatal hemlock, was his *mission.* This God called him to. This he never forgot, never intermitted, never wearied of. He prosecuted it at home and abroad, in the army and in the city, in the private house and in the senate chamber, in the shop of the artisan and on the public street, by day and by night, to the end of life. No hostility could prevent him, no prospect of a martyr's death could induce him, to cease his efforts to lead the young and the old, all classes and all ranks of his fellow citizens, to a knowledge of themselves, their nature, their mission and their various duties.

Yet he was not a professional teacher. He neither asked nor received wages. He did not set himself up, and advertise for pupils. He disclaimed the title of teacher, and called neither man nor child his disciple. He wished no one to call

him by any name that assumed, that he was superior to other men. Socrates was his name, not Professor Socrates, nor Dr. Socrates, nor Socrates the Sage, nor Socrates the Philosopher. He had no building where he lectured, no desk at which he gave lessons. He did not so much as promise to teach anybody anything. He rather wondered that men would flock to him and that parents persisted in sending their sons to him. He would not forbid them to come. He was glad to see them, to talk with and question them, and to have them listen to his conversations with others, if they liked. They might stay by him as long as they chose, but they should not pay him for his company, nor for his talk. He would not be the slave of patrons. He would not hire out his mind and tongue for so much an hour, or a day. He taught at no fixed time nor place. He used no text-books. He read no lectures. He was the professor of no special science. He heard no recitations. Yet he had his method of teaching, to which we may turn our attention. The occasion of his abandonment of his hereditary occupation, and entrance upon the work of public instruction, was as follows: He had observed with much regret how the opinions of the Athenian youth were misled, and their principles and tastes corrupted, by a body of professional men, known as Sophists, who for money and renown engaged to enlighten all men. They were brilliant and learned, at least so far as the use of words was concerned, disputatious, and generally wealthy and powerful. They were the intellectual leaders of the age. They indulged in all manner of refined speculations upon nature and the origin of things. Around them flocked the rich and noble youth of every city they entered. They taught the art of disputation, and of false reasoning—"making the worse appear the better reason."

Suddenly, there appeared among them a new and strange antagonist. He was a perfect contrast to themselves. They appeared in gorgeous flowing robes, and were followed by an eager crowd of listeners. He was poor and humbly clad, and the Sophists affected to treat him with contempt. They were dignified and stately and cultured. He was rude and

ungainly in appearance, and uncouth in manners. He wandered about the streets of Athens, barefoot and absorbed in thought, sometimes standing for hours in the public places, fixed in thought, unconscious of all that was passing on around him. In external appearance, though a man of vigorous and powerful frame, he was such an one as might well have tempted the wit and ridicule of the thoughtless. His nose was flat, his nostrils were wide and upturned, his lips were thick, his eye-balls projected, his figure was unwieldly. Ridicule had in him a target for her arrows. Every day he strolled into the market-place to talk with all whom he met. He simply converses—asks questions. He became an object of attention, and soon excited and enchained curiosity, fascinating the ears of those whom his personal appearance disgusted. He became known to all. He talked with all, with persons of both sexes, and every age, on all subjects connected with daily life, with duty and with happiness. Wherever he went, whomsoever he met, now in a saddler's shop, now in the market, now meeting a merchant and now a child, sitting or walking, he talked and taught, giving lessons on saddlery or statesmanship, on the rules of trade, the laws of mercantile life, or the duties of children. Men of State came to him to learn the art of government. An election draws from him a conversation on the duties of citizens and magistrates. He meets in the street a young and beautiful stranger, and struck with his intellectual countenance, he places his staff across his path, stops him, and by a few questions binds forever to him the future historian Xenophon. At a festival where wine is freely flowing, he discourses on temperance. To an atheist whom he accidentally meets he demonstrates the being and providence of the gods. To a disobedient son he talks on filial duty, and to alienated brothers on the beauty of fraternal love. He humbles the conceited, encourages the diffident, overwhelms the profligate and licentious with shame, and bestows a deserved praise on the courageous and virtuous. Thus he went about talking everywhere, till the whole city was his school-room, and the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant

were his pupils. Especially did Socrates delight to meet men who were renowned for wisdom, or any intellectual eminence, and question them. He was the declared questioner of all men. While he gained a great many friends and admirers, he also provoked a large number of personal enemies.

The Sophists, among whom he has been most unjustly ranked, were especially hostile to him, nor he less to them. He never neglected an opportunity to meet and confute them. They had slighted and denied the truth. Truth was the one mistress of his soul. They dsserted her for wrong and for renown. He clung to her and adored her, in poverty. They professed to know and to teach all sciences. He only knew that he knew nothing, and all he hoped to do was to help his fellow-men learn a little, by pointing out to them their mistakes. He gave nothing, he simply helped to bring ideas out of the souls of other men. He was, to use his own homely illustration, drawn from the occupation of his own wife, an accoucher of ideas. He had nothing to put into men's minds.

Socrates must have been a terrible antagonist to all people who believed they were wise because they could talk fluently. There were men of that class then, as now, the rapid and vapid talkers of the age, whose fulness of words is only to be compared to the leanness of their ideas. Socrates declared that, as for himself, he knew nothing. And when a man professed knowledge on any point, especially if he drew after him admiring crowds who called him wise, Socrates was sure to step up modestly through the crowd and, professing ignorance, ask to be taught. Charmed with so humble a listener, the teacher begins. Soon Socrates modestly interrogates him and gets his assent to some very plain and evident proposition. Then he would draw his assent to a conclusion just as evident. Then, perhaps, another, and now he is lost. Socrates takes up his admissions, and with great power of logic, and a subtlety equal to that of the Sophists themselves, he weaves a web around this seemingly wise man, from which he cannot escape. He shows him to what monstrous conclusion his admissions lead him. The laughter of the bystanders proclaims his discomfiture; and he knows not whither to

turn, while the uncouth and imperturbably calm and apparently innocent Socrates stands before him as if he had done nothing to make him so ridiculous. Confused, ashamed, indignant at himself, and enraged at his strange antagonist, he flies from the spot.

Socrates describes, in his amusing way, how he went to a number of persons, who were esteemed to be wise, and examined them. First, he went to the politicians, then to some poets, then to artificers with the hope of gaining something from each. From the politicians he wanted to learn something about government, but came away, saying, "I am wiser than they, for neither of us know anything valuable, but they, not knowing, fancy they do know, while I, not knowing, do not think that I do know. In one small matter, therefore, I am wiser than they." But he affronted them all, as he did also poets and artificers, by his rude way of demonstrating their ignorance, and many of them became his enemies.

Thus Socrates went among men. He was always to be found when crowds were assembled, as on market days. He gave no lectures. He only talked, it mattered not with whom. He was the great questioner of his age. Many persons made it their habit to attend him in public. If he went into the market-place, into the gymnasia, or the public schools, no matter where, they followed and surrounded him, to hear what he would say to men. He demanded money from no one for his services. And in that golden age of Grecian literature, when everybody was writing and publishing, Socrates, the best, the wisest, and the most thoughtful man living, wrote nothing, published nothing. Fame was to him an empty word. The immortality that many of his contemporaries sought, perished with the books they wrote. Socrates simply conversed, talked, argued, defended truth and justice, assailed error and wrong, and moulded the lives of men, trying to make them humble, honest and true, and loving disciples have transmitted to us both his wisdom and a portrait of the man himself.

Such is the general picture of the ancient master. The sketches of the modern, Arnold of Rugby must be briefer.

Thomas Arnold was really one of the great and good men of modern England, I may say, of modern times. For his fearless sincerity, his love of truth, his comprehensive and ever active humanity, he stands pre-eminent among modern worthies.

He was born in 1795. His childhood was remarkable. At the early age of three years, he received from his father a present of Smollett's History of England, as a reward for the accuracy with which he had gone through the stories connected with the portraits and pictures of the successive reigns of England's sovereigns, and at the same tender age, he used to sit at a table and arrange geographical cards, recognizing by their shape, at a glance, the different countries of a dissected map of England. Before he was seven years of age, he had written a little tragedy on Percy, Earl of Northumberland, accurate in language, orthography, blank-verse metre, and in the arrangement of the different acts and scenes. In early boyhood, he gained from his playmates the name, "the Poet Arnold," from his success in poetic composition. He was remarkably forward in history. When he was a Professor at Oxford, he quoted from Dr. Priestley's Lectures on History, which he had read when he was but eight years of age, and had not subsequently seen. He was shy and retiring in his boyhood, but one of his schoolmates says of him, "He was stiff in his opinions, and utterly immovable, by force or by fraud, when he had made up his mind, whether right or wrong.

We pass by the record of his early school days, of his college life, and of the few years which he spent as a private tutor, at Laleham, and come at once to that period of his life which has made him so familiar and so dear to us, as Arnold of Rugby. Before entering upon the head-mastership of that famous school, which he did at the age of thirty-three, his character was already formed and his reputation widely extended. It had been prophesied of him by a distinguished Professor at Oxford, that, if he was "elected to the head of Rugby, he would change the face of education all through

the public schools of England." "What a pity," it was said, "that a man fit to be a statesman should be employed in teaching schoolboys." Rugby was a school for boys alone. It more nearly resembled one of our large classical academies than any other of our schools. It embraced so large a number of pupils, that Arnold had under him several assistant masters. Let us describe the general system which he pursued for the fourteen years that he was at Rugby.

The work was admirably suited to his natural tastes. He loved to teach, and the love had grown so strongly upon him, that he sometimes declared that he could hardly live without such employment. The vigor and intensity of his spirit fitted him also to deal with the young, rather than with the old. He was enthusiastic, most thoroughly in earnest, and had a deep-seated sympathy with the early growth and development of character. Teaching was a work of love and choice, not of necessity. It was a life-work, not a stepping stone to something else. It was the end. He had peculiar ideas of what education should be, and had a favorite theory of what a school should be, and he set himself to work it out. He was a man of intense and glowing earnestness, of great simplicity and frankness of character, eager and sanguine in his search for the truth, deeply humble and modest, and a man who had a solemn and ever-abiding sense of his responsibility to his pupils and to God.

With this hasty and imperfect sketch of Arnold, let us now bring the prominent characteristics of these two masters in the art of teaching together, that we may see how far they were models for all subsequent teachers. The human mind abides in its integrity, from age to age; so, too, the principles and the art of training it, cannot greatly differ from generation to generation.

I. Both Socrates and Arnold were distinguished for *humility.* There was no pretension in them. The passwords into the kingdom of heaven, and into the kingdom of science, are the same—"Except ye become as little children, ye cannot enter." The Delphic Oracle declared Socrates to be the wisest man of Greece, because he taught that all human knowledge

was "qualified ignorance." "It would be a great mistake," said Arnold, in reference to his school at Rugby, "if I were to try to make myself here into a Pope." He disclaimed all appeals to himself as certain authority, and discountenanced every mere echo of his own opinions. He placed himself on a level with his pupils in his search for truth. Intellectually, as well as morally, he felt that a teacher, no less than a disciple, ought always to be learning. One of Arnold's assistants at Rugby, says of him, that he possessed "such a true humility, and such an unaffected simplicity, that others were inspired with the same feeling, and a belief that they could be like him.

Both he and Socrates were at all times ready to confess ignorance, and take the place of learners at the feet of any man. It is said of the ancient, that there was in him such a child-like humility and such a freshness of youthful sympathy, that he became a general favorite with the young men of Athens. There was, indeed, something of irony in it, when the great Grecian, would come as a learner, who knew nothing, before some loud and pretentious talker of his day, and then, little by little, perplex, astonish and confound the assumption of his would-be master, by a few questions.

There have been two classes of teachers in the world. The first know everything, and can teach everything. They deem it a disgrace not to be able to do everything and to explain everything, and so they undertake, or pretend to do that for which they are totally unfit. They deem themselves incapable of making a mistake, and are beyond the necessity of changing their opinions. Infallible as oracles, unchangeable as fate, omnipotent as Jove, they can learn nothing and are a final court of appeals on all subjects.

Homer tells us in his incomparable Iliad, of Phœnix, the self-complacent teacher of Achilles' boyhood, and represents him as saying to the pupil through whom his own name has strayed down the ages,

> "Great as thou art, my lessons made thee brave
> A child I took thee, and a hero gave."

The descendants of Phœnix still survive. They "continue with us" till this day. They are the creators of their pupils. With a sweet self-flattery they crown themselves with all the honors that may, perchance, be gained by any who have received instruction at their hands.

The second class of teachers are humble. They arrogate nothing to themselves. They profess to teach but little. They are helpers. They claim no creative power. Their pupils will remain, after all their touches and training, very much as God has made them, and what they make of themselves. It will be as much as they aspire to, if they can awaken them to what they are by nature—what boundless plains of knowledge are before, what wondrous, undeveloped powers are within them, and what destinies they may attain. They claim only to be guide-posts on the outskirts of a great domain. They can go with their pupils but a little way at the farthest. They have not mapped out and traversed those illimitable fields. They only point the way to them. They are not slow, nor ashamed to confess their ignorance. They are themselves scholars, who have a little more experience than their pupils, and they humbly place it at their disposal. As Arnold said to a pupil of his, "You come here, not to read, but to learn how to read," so say they of every department of science. You come not to be put in possession of these things, but to learn how you may gain possession yourself. They are not Popes. They do not presume to dictate. They say to none "go," as one that has authority, but "come" and together with their pupils, in the spirit of little children, do they enter into the kingdom of science. This is the evangelical virtue of the school-room, never to grow old in spirit, nor proud in heart, to combine the wisdom and experience of age, with the freshness and beauty of an immortal youth —the head of a sage, but the heart of a child.

II. It was a characteristic of both Socrates and Arnold, that at the very outset, they sought to learn for themselves, and have their pupils learn also something of the nature, powers and capacities of that mind which was to be educated.

It is said of Socrates, that his first endeavor was to convict

his pupils of ignorance—to prove to them that they knew nothing. He would correct errors rather than impart truth. He would secure a humble, teachable, inquiring state of mind, rather than impart the knowledge of outward things. He considered well the instrument he was going to work with and work upon, the human mind, yea, more than that, *the immortal person;* what faculties he has, for what purpose they were given, how they may be improved, developed, perfected, what a man can know, what he must remain ignorant of, how much a pupil must do for himself, how much a teacher may, and ought to do for him, and how much is beyond them both, and rests with the Father of our spirits. He knew that there were more things beyond explanation than within it, and more things that the mind cannot do, than it is capable of.

Great and good teachers have always been characterized by that modesty, that willingly lets alone the things which are beyond our capacity and out of our sphere, and also for their earnestness, skill and success in taking out of the mind the roots of false knowledge, and preparing the soil for what is good and true. The earlier stages of instruction with both Socrates and Arnold, were negative rather than positive. There was first a process of unlearning, a training of the mind, in picking out and casting away from its already gathered stores, all that was useless and false material. They would clear away all rubbish, and lay a good and strong foundation, for a safe, sound and beautiful structure.

Our fathers of a half century or more ago, were wont in their sermons, to treat their texts, first negatively, then positively, *e. g.*, 1. What faith is not. 2. What faith is. There was something of nature and wisdom in the method, for there is often as much in knowing what a thing is not, as in knowing what it is. It is full as difficult to get error out of the mind as to get truth into it. An entrenched falsehood is a difficult foe to dislodge. The semblance and counterfeits of truth, are our worst enemies. Great reformers have always been mighty inconoclasts. Bacon compares the human mind to a heathen temple full of idols. These must be demolished

before the worship of truth can be established. Socrates went among his fellow men, breaking the images which they had set up in their minds. Arnold sought to clear the way for the mind to act freely, disabused of prejudices and errors. Truth needs a clear, clean soil.

III. A third peculiarity, of both Socrates and Arnold, was the facility and skill with which they adapted their teachings to all classes of pupils.

Xenophon pronounces the highest eulogium upon Socrates, when he says of him, "He did not approach all in the same manner." And the biographer of Arnold dwells upon the fact of his different treatment of his pupils, expelling some for offences which seemed to be trifling, and retaining others who were guilty of gross offences.

They seemed to discern the character of their pupils as if by instinct, and then to adapt their teachings to them, encouraging the diffident, repressing the forward, humbling the conceited, and persuading every one to make the most of what was good in him. They no more thought of applying the same discipline, and the same instruction to them all, than a physician would think of administering the same medicine to all his patients. They made it a constant study to vary and adapt their instructions to the different characters and tendencies of their pupils. They made them a study, becoming as thoroughly acquainted with them as possible, and making each one acquainted with himself, his vices and his virtues, his defects and his capabilities. Socrates and Arnold had, both, a deep respect for the human mind in itself. It was a sacred thing—an image of the Divine.

Socrates would as soon stop in the way and teach some poor craftsman, as the noblest senator of Greece, and Arnold steadily withheld his respect and praise from mere talent and brilliancy, and gave it to the industry and zeal of some plodding boy, of inferior natural powers, who had some noble moral aim.

IV. Both Socrates and Arnold were most unweariedly *patient and thorough* in imparting the truths of their teaching. They were in no haste to carry their pupils through the whole

curriculum of knowledge. It is said of the ancient master, that he was never in a hurry. Even when the Grecian army was defeated and scattered at Delium, and both cavalry and foot were fleeing in total rout, Plato tells us that Socrates walked from the field, and darted his regards around with a majestic composure, looking tranquilly on both his friends and enemies, and departed in safety, for no one dared to attack him. Socrates never cared how much time was necessary to develop a great idea, or establish an important truth. He would begin at the beginning of a subject, go slowly forward, feeling his way at every step, starting objections, examining all sides, reviewing positions, and at last coming to a conclusion, which was never again to be called into question. Patient and thorough himself, he inculcated these virtues in others, as of far greater value than any amount of mere knowledge. The knowledge was not to be compared to the knowing mind.

Arnold also, in a letter to a friend, reveals his views on this point when he says, "I would be as patient as I could, with irresolution, unsteadiness and fits of idleness." He considered the greatest ignorance or dulness a very light evil compared with profligacy or wilful irregularity. In illustration of his patience and persistency in dealing with the human mind, he uses the figure of one kicking a foot-ball up hill, kicking it onwards twenty yards, and it rolling back nineteen between the blows. He once got out of patience, and spoke sharply to a dull, plodding pupil, when the boy looked up in his face and said, "Why do you speak angrily, sir? Indeed I am doing the best I can." Years afterwards, he used to tell the story to his children, and say, "I never felt so much ashamed in my life—that look and that speech, I have never forgotten."

When asked if he did not find the repetition of the same lessons irksome to him, "No," he said, "there is a constant freshness in them. I find something new in them every time I go over them." There was neither for him nor his pupils a royal road to learning, nor any secret path of arriving at the distant and coveted goal, without passing over the inter-

STATE LIBRARY HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

vening space. There have been those, in every age, who would bring all subjects of human inquiry within the scope of one grand science, of which they are the masters. By the aid of their art, their pupils, like themselves, would be enabled to comprehend, at once, all kinds of knowledge, and discourse, with fluency and accuracy, not only on every subject, but on every side of every subject; and of this art they could be put in complete possession in a very limited amount of time. Our modern age has abounded with itinerant lecturers and "Professors," as well as with authors, who engage to put a pupil through a science as a conductor engages to carry a passenger over a road, in so many hours and minutes. They are the quacks among teachers, though they bristle all over with certificates of what they have accomplished. Neither Socrates nor Arnold was a man of Profession, or of haste. The large promises made by many of our modern teachers and schools of learning, the high-sounding names that many of the latter bear, the formidable display of departments and Professorships, and Lectureships, and text-books, would surely bring the great Grecian humbly knocking at their doors for admission.

V. There was, further, with Socrates and Arnold a *most hearty sympathy* with all whom they sought to instruct. They had a deep respect for human nature, wherever found, in man or boy.

The Grecian talked with all. He had no favorites. The rich and the poor, the wise and the ignorant, the higher and the lower classes, were all alike to him. Senators or marketers, a philosopher or a cobbler, an old man or a truant boy, it was all the same. He had time and patience for all. He despised none. He respected all who desired to know the truth on any subject, or who would learn to do better the least of all life's duties. Arnold also evinced the same deep and peculiar interest in his pupils. "He calls us fellows," was the astonished expression of the boys when they heard him speak of them by the familiar name in use among themselves. And, in later years, they observed the pleasure and interest with

which, in the long autumn afternoons, he would often stand in the school-field and watch the issue of their favorite games of foot-ball. The same anxiety which he manifested for their good in the school, he showed in their subsequent life. His biographer has left on record many instances of this character, his remembrance of his pupils for many years, his joy over their successes, and sorrow over their failures. It was a fixed principle with Arnold to trust his pupils. He was not suspicious. He would believe good rather than evil. He showed disappointment when evil came. The boys used to say that it was "a shame to tell Arnold a lie, for he always believed one's word." It was a secret of his success. It showed his knowledge of human nature, especially of youthful nature. In this trait lay one of the hidings of his power. Respecting the boy's nature, he made him respect himself; trusting to his honor, he made him honorable. There is a style of dealing with human nature that grudges any recognition of good in it, and that metes out to it, in youth or man, the scantiest encouragement and the most tardy and reluctant praise; that is always, by its suspicious manner, insulting it, and provoking it to evil. There is a temptation to think the worst of youthful nature, and to put it under guard. Arnold was never on the watch. He would not act the part of a detective police. He would not have suspicions. He sought to cultivate manliness and right purposes, by showing that he appealed and trusted to them, in his pupils. The honor and the conscience of a boy were as dear and sacred to him as his own. His own frank, unsuspicious confidence quickened all the goodness there was in one, disarmed all meanness, and created around him a public sentiment of honor and faithfulness, that made the school very largely the administrator of its own discipline. The subtle bonds of mutual confidence and respect, were mightier than any insignia of authority, or than any fears of penalty.

VI. Both Socrates and Arnold evidently had that idea of education, now so universally admitted, by thinking men, to be the true idea, namely, that it is a development of what is within, rather than a communication of something from with-

out. Our modern theories of education all dismiss those mechanical resemblances which liken the mind to a storehouse, a granary, a museum, or a library, and agree that it does not consist in inserting facts into a pupil's memory, like specimens in a cabinet, or like apples dropped into an empty barrel, or freight stowed away in a hold of a ship. Nor is the mind a piece of iron to be laid on an anvil and hammered into some preconceived shape, or a block of marble, from which we are to chip off the rubbish until we find the statue within. It is rather flame, that is to be fed, a germ, that is to be developed, a living, active being, that must be incited and strengthened to think and to feel, "to do, to dare and to suffer." As a germ expands, indeed, under the influence of air and sunshine and moisture from without, and yet, only because of the urgency of its own internal force, so to the mind external things are only provocatives of its own hidden powers. That only is of value to it, which elicits, guides and perfects the vital force within. It is perpetually insisted upon, in this age, that knowledge is not the end of study, but is subordinate to the devepolment of the mind itself—the culture of its faculties. Thus felt Socrates, and he made it his office, not so much to impart ideas and to put men in possession of truths, as to aid them in the development of the powers God had bestowed upon them. He aimed at discipline and culture. The *process* was the important thing. The training, the development of the knowing mind, was more valuable than any amount of mere knowledge, just as a good farm, prepared for us, is worth more than the largest crop of corn ever raised upon it. A well disciplined mind is better than all the facts it has in possession, just as a man is worth more than all his property.

Upon this idea of education, was founded that method of instruction, pursued by both these men with such remarkable success—the method of questioning. So familiar was it to the ancient teacher, that it has come down to us embalmed in his name—"the Socratic method." He was peculiarly skilled in the art of questioning. He inspired the deepest interest and enthusiasm, awakening the minds of his

pupils to their utmost activity. He had a double object, to show them how little they knew, and so, what they really *did* know, and to lead them to think and reason for themselves.

In like manner, Arnold's whole method was founded on the principle of awakening the intellect. From his own intense earnestness, everyone caught a sympathetic thrill. He taught mainly by questioning, not in a dull, uninteresting, unsympathizing way, not by repeating in monotonous routine, the questions of a text-book, but in earnest, animated, unexpected forms. As a general rule, he never gave information, except as a kind of reward for a good answer. He often withheld it altogether, checking himself at times in the very act of giving it, as if he had observed a lack of interest in his pupils, and could not, therefore, squander his truth upon the unappreciative. His explanations were as short as possible, merely enough to dispose of the difficulty, or to clear a way to its solution, or to whet the curiosity of an inquiring mind. He worked not for, but with his pupils. The scantiness with which he dealt out his knowledge, often provoked a half angry feeling of disappointment. His object was, to set his pupils right, not by correcting them at once, but by helping them to discover the true answer. He used their minds in unfolding the truth. He made explorers and discoverers of them. He pushed them on, as pioneers, into the country already thoroughly trodden by his own feet. His great excellence was in his wonderful power and skill in giving impulse to other minds, in inspiring their enthusiasm in the search for truth. No mere text-book teacher can have an inspiring power. He who would spread life and light about him, whether in a university or primary school, will be successful according as he approaches the truth, the vitality, and the naturalness, of the "Socratic method." The tree of knowledge is not the tree of life. A walking encyclopedia is good for occasional reference, but a living, earnest, thoughtful, inspiriting man, is worth more than a thousand encyclopedias.

VII. This earnestness, joined with an intense reality, was a characteristic of both Socrates and Arnold. In their com-

pany, one felt the presence of real men. There was no pretence, nor show, nor seeming about them. They affected nothing. They were genuine and solid throughout, saying what they meant to say, and meaning what they said. They illustrated that essential requisite of all true teaching in the family, the school-room, the pulpit, everywhere—that we know what we are talking about, and that we feel what we speak. None dislike pretence more than the young, and they are peculiarily sharp and quick-sighted in detecting it. A heartless man cannot inspire a deep conviction. "If you see me weep, the first sorrow is for thee," says an old proverb, and it speaks truly. As well have instruction conveyed into a recitation room through pipes in a wall, as through a heartless man of routine. A lifeless, unenthusiastic teacher, plodding through his daily toil, as if it were a dead repetition of meaningless things, inspires us no more than the monotonous tread of a wood-sawing horse in a rail-way shed. Every profession is cursed with the men of routine, who walk in the old ruts of precedent. There are lawyers who plead like parrots, doctors who give medicine by the book, as a miller gives grist by the bag, though without his care to give each man his own. There are preachers who obey but the latter half of the injunction to "draw out things *new* and *old*." There are mechanics, and manufacturers, and engineers who think as little in their work, as do the levers, and shuttles and planes they so mechanically use. There are teachers, whose teaching is as prosy and somnolent as the tiresome drone of a beetle. Over the door of the school-room should ever be written, "Be earnest, be genuine, be true." Both Socrates and Arnold had this power of inspiration. The wild and roystering Alcibiades, came in his youth, under the influence of Socrates, who drew him away from his company and his cups, and made him ashamed of himself. He says: "When I hear him speak, my heart leaps up far more than the hearts of those who celebrate the Corybantic mysteries, my tears are poured out as he talks—a thing I have seen happen to many others besides myself. I stop my ears, as from the Sirens, and flee away as fast as possible, that I may not sit down and grow old in listening

to his talk. I hide myself from him, and when I see him, I am overwhelmed with humiliation, because I have neglected to do what I confessed to him ought to be done, and often and often, have I wished that he were no longer to be seen among men."

So also, the biographer of Arnold tells us, that so deep and earnest was he, that he made his "interest in the struggle of the political and ecclesiastical world, react on his interest in the school, and invest it, in his eyes, with a new importance. The social evils of the country awakened a deep desire to check the thoughtless waste and selfishness of his school boys." When any "striking good or evil happened in any part of the wide range of English dominion," he at once thought of the "important scenes some of his own scholars might be called to enter," and quickened in him the hope, that "when they went forth amidst the strife of tongues and minds, they might be endowed with the spirit of wisdom and of power." He governed the school precisely on the same principles as he would have governed an empire, imparting to them the noblest and highest truths at his command.

VIII. One thing more remains to be mentioned. We have referred to the true idea of educating, as being not the communication of knowledge, but the stimulating of the faculties, the development of the mind. We must enlarge the idea, and make it embrace the whole man. It is not adroit and dexterous brains alone we want. It is not sharp boys and keen men the world most needs. In its highest sense, education is the training of the *man.* It is the culture and discipline of the whole nature. Our youth need healthy hearts as well as agile minds. They need to be trained to pure affections. They need to be taught to love goodness, and to hate wrong—to be reverent, truthful, brave, temperate, religious—let it be repeated, *religious.*

Both Socrates and Arnold subordinated all other teaching to the moral culture of the soul, and regarded themselves as instruments of Divine Providence. They magnified their office as if they were Apostles. A humble, profound and most religious consciousness that work, work for God, and

truth and human good, in the appointed calling of man on earth, and that *he* had a special work to carry forward in the fear of God, inspired Arnold with a lofty and contagious enthusiasm. That work was, to use his own words, "To make the school-room, with God's blessing, a place of Christian education." The idea, that lay at the basis of all his efforts for his pupils was, that they were to be trained for a Christian manhood. "The business of a school master," said he, "no less than that of a parish minister, is the cure of souls." He placed the cross on the top of his school-building, as a visible symbol of the Christian, and of all true education. He cultivated the moral nature, he taught religion, not by giving theological lectures, not by discussing the doctrines of the Bible, nor by introducing sacred words into school admonitions, but by the constant and natural application of Christian principles. Not by temporary appeals to the feelings, nor by "sermonizing," but by continually doing what was right, and speaking what was true, and inculcating on his pupils an inquiring love of truth. and a devoted practice of goodness, did he teach *religion.* His Rugby School Sermons are models of earnest, thoughtful, loving counsels to the young, on the highest themes of Christian life, and the highest forms of Christian duty.

So also, Socrates says of himself, "I go about, O Athenians, doing nothing else than persuading you, both young and old, to take no care, either for the body or riches, prior to, or so much as for, the soul, how it may be made most perfect, telling you that virtue does not proceed from riches, but riches and all other blessings from virtue. The good man is the wise and happy man. The bad man is both a fool and a wretch. Wisdom, piety and happiness are one and the same, so also, folly, sin and misery." And after he was condemned to die, he turned to his judges and said: "Punish my sons when they grow up, O judges, if they appear to care for riches or anything else before virtue."

To Arnold, mere intellectual cleverness or acuteness, separated from goodness, was more revolting than the most hopeless imbecility. "Before a lad of moral thoughtfulness,

high principles and honest industry," said he, "I would stand hat in hand." Neither the body nor the soul, was to be sacrificed to the intellect. That which is immortal and spiritual must have the highest place in all human training. We do not need prodigies in learning for the world's want. Intellectual giants are clumsy and useless, dissociated from the cultured moral faculties. The future does not ask us that we train up for it mere lawyers and judges, physicians and merchants, but also, and chiefly, that we train up consciences and hearts, that out of our youth we make healthy, hearty, genial, earnest, strong, truth-loving, God-fearing men, and pure, modest, intelligent, gentle and trustful women. The profession of a teacher rises infinitely higher than his text-books. We insult and belittle it, when we make it less than a vocation—a divine calling to teach divine truths—to make the men and women of the coming age, better, purer, nobler, than the men and women of the present. The school-room, like the church, should ever open up into God's heaven. It should be a sanctuary from the passions of the street and of evil homes. It should be regarded, from its lowest forms where childhood gathers, to the class-room of the university, as a little kingdom where the teacher is God's vice gerent, to administer truth, justice and love, to teach candor, magnanimity, veracity, tenderness, honor, reverence, worship, every virtue that would grace a child's breast, or be a diadem on the brow of years. It is a place where foundations are laid for men—men who years hence, will be fit and ready for all places and all crises, who will be self-reliant in danger, unseducible by temptations, brave against wrong, tenacious for truth, genial and gentle, patient in suffering, reverent towards religion, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord, a place, too, where are trained the women, who in the future will rule, because they are womanly, pure, true, sacrificing, loving.

But they who would train up such characters, must first be such themselves. They must be manly, womanly, Christian. They must march the whole road on which they would have their disciples go. The glory of this high, noble, Christian character must gleam out of their own lives. They

must authenticate in their own bearing, every principle of honor, of truth and of goodness which they inculcate. They are, under Christ, who is "the Head of every man," the masters of immortal rearing. They shape destinies. Their labor is not the work of a day nor of a year. Their success is not to be determined by the "exhibition days" of an ended term, by the eclat of an examination, the speeches and the congratulations of the closing day. The future will tell. Manhood and womanhood will tell. Their work must pass the criticism of years. It must take its place in the building up of families, societies, states, and the kingdom of Christ. The tooth of time must eat at it. The trials and temptations of years, must test it. And on that "last great day," for which all other days are made, and to which they hasten, when every man's work will be tried, of what sort it is, the judgment of the Infinite One will be pronounced upon the work which every teacher has done. Happy shall he be whose work stands approved as that of a wise master-builder.

ARTICLE V.

METHOD OF STUDYING THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

By Prof. Edsall Ferrier, A. M., of Pennsylvania College.

The question is repeatedly asked, What materials are available for the careful and intelligent study of the English Language? It is a recognized principle with all good teachers of the ancient languages, that the true end of study can be attained only by close and unremitting attention to details. The roots must be dug up, the peculiar idioms explored, the accents examined, the law of construction as to words and

sentences faithfully investigated, the allusions traced out, and the rhetorical forms noted and classified. We feel the power of a literature, only as we are thus brought in close and earnest contact with the language which expresses it. We reach the life of a people, by familiar intercourse with the details of the tongue which they used. Substances do not affect the sense of taste, until they are dissolved, and thus language does not make its deepest impression on our moral and intellectual life, until it is broken in a thousand fragments, or so dissolved. that its life is transfused into our own. That is a highly significant passage found in the diary of the late Dr. James Hamilton, of London: "Read forty lines of Homer, with the faithful use of the lexicon and grammar." The destination is reached over no royal highway. Until the last, the lexicon must be turned over, and the grammar consulted.

For pursuing this method of study with the Latin and Greek, there can be no difficulty. The materials are abundant and available. It is not so generally admitted or known, that our own language may be studied in the same manner with great profit, and with greatly increased interest; not by any means as a substitute for the study of the ancient languages, but as complementary. Extended and costly experiments in education, both in this country and in Europe, have settled the question, that for the purpose of the highest intellectual and æsthetic culture, and as educational instruments in the largest sense, the modern languages can not take the place of the ancient.

For the purpose of illustrating a method in which the study of our own tongue may be pursued, a brief passage has been selected for examination from the 137th Psalm:

"Let my right hand forget her cunning."

On looking at this expression, the attention of an intelligent person is at once arrested by the peculiar use of the word *let*. The same form is at one time permissive, at another prohibitory. In this clause, or in Exodus 8 : 28, "Pharoah said, I will *let* you go," it is obviously permissive. But Latimer,

in one of his sermons, says: "The flesh resisteth the work of the Holy Ghost, and *lets* it;" and in Hamlet 1:4, when Hamlet resolves to follow the Ghost of the murdered Claudius, despite the entreaties and warning of Horatius and Marcellus, he cries out: "By heaven, I'll make a ghost of him that *lets* me." As recent a writer as Tennyson, sometimes over fond of antiquated idioms and old words, says:

> "Mine ancient wound is hardly whole,
> And *lets* me from the saddle."

Ingenious but unsuccessful attempts have been made to reconcile these contradictory uses of the same form, assuming that in some unaccountable mode, they have attained these divergent meanings. The difficulty is simply and satisfactorily solved by the fact, that they are two distinct words, and have a different origin. Though both are Saxon as to their source, *let*, in the sense of hinder, is from *Lettan*, and *let*, in the permissive sense, is from *Loetan*, words entirely different in form and pronunciation.

The second thing to which the attention may be turned, is a peculiar grammatical idiom. In the ordinary analysis of the sentence, the verb *forget* is in the infinitive mood, and made dependent on the leading verb, *let*. It seems, then, after certain verbs in our language, the infinitive is employed without the usal sign *to*. How this result has been brought about, and why this difference of usage, have been made a subject of much curious discussion. Some have explained it on euphonic principles. The most learned investigation is in a paper read by Dr. Guest, before the London Philological Society, on the 13th of March, 1846. There has been a peculiar conflict between the gerund and the present infinitive. In the early history, the *to* was prefixed to the gerund, but never to the infinitive. As it became quite common to use the latter for the former, the usual sign was transferred from the one to the other. Hence, at various stages of the language, the usage is not uniform, showing a conflict between the two grammattical forms. In Midsummer-Night's Dream, occurs the line: "How long within this wood intend you

stay?" and in Spenser: "Whom, when on the ground, she grovelling saw to roll." In Othello 4: 2, Emilia says of Desdemona:

> "I durst, my lord, to wager she is honest,
> Lay down my soul at stake."

We are thus furnished with a key to that common rule of our grammar, that after certain verbs, as *bid*, *dare*, &c., the infinitive is used without the preposition. The reason of the rule is found, not in the euphonic character of the words, but in the conscious or unconscious attempt to transfer a feature of the gerund to the infinitive. This intrusion was resisted by phrases to which the popular ear had long been familiarized, hence the want of uniform usage.

A few years since, in listening to an exposition of 1 Corinthians 13 : 5, "Seeketh not her own," by a preacher of very respectable talents, he ventured the suggestion that the pronoun *her* must be a case of Personification. Had he made even a cursory examination, he would have been impressed with the large number of such rhetorical forms, for, with a single apparent exception, the word *its*, is not found in the translation of 1611. "Let my right hand forget *her* cunning." The seeming exception is in Leviticus 25 : 5, in the clause: "That which groweth of *it* own accord." At that period in the history of our tongue, *it* was frequently used as a neuter possessive. In King John 2 : 1, from the folio edition of 1623, is the following passage in illustration:

> "Doe childe, goe to yt grandame, childe,
> Guie grandame kingdom, and it grandame will
> Guie yt a plum, a cherry and a figge."

The Ghost in Hamlet 1 : 2, is thus described:

> "It lifted vp it head, and did addresse
> It selfe to motion, like as it would speake."

The form *it's* occurs ten times in Shakspeare, having an apostrophe, and thus being an ordinary genitive in form. This

seems to be the second stage in the process of forming our present neuter possessive.

> "How sometimes nature will betray it's folly,
> It's tenderness!"—*The Winter's Tale* 1 : 2

Marsh assigns as an approximate date for the introduction of the word *its*, the year 1600, and says: "Ben Jonson employs *its* in his works, but does not recognize it in his grammar. It occurs rarely in Milton's prose, and not above three or four times in his poetry. Fuller has it in some of his works, in others, he rejects it. In the Pisgah Sight of Palestine, printed in 1650, both forms are applied to a neuter noun in the course of a single sentence, and quotes from Book II., page 58: "Many miles hence, this river solitarily runs on, as sensible of *its* sad fate, suddenly to fall into the Dead Sea, where all *his* comfort is to have the company of two other brooks."

There are some curious facts connected with the history of the neuter pronoun. In the passage from the first Book of Paradise Lost:

> "His form
> Had not lost all *her* original brightness,
> Nor appeared less than archangel ruined,"

Dr. Jamieson, in his work on rhetoric, charges Milton with bad grammar, in making use of the feminine gender. *Its*, in Milton's day, was a novel word, and had scarcely been domesticated in the language. This word has also an interesting connection with that series of remarkable forgeries, which Thomas Chatterton, for a season, so successfully palmed upon the public. Those papers, pretending to be copies of old documents found in Canynge's coffer, were first discovered to be forgeries, by their containing words, modern in use or origin. The word *mortmal*, which Chatterton found in Chaucer's description of the cook, and means simply a dish, he ignorantly used in the sense of gangrene; and the word *drawing* was used with the meaning it now bears—a meaning acquired since the beginning of the seventeenth century. But suspi-

cion was at first aroused by the noticeable frequency of the neuter possessive.

Dean Trench, in his Study of Words, has an interesting paragraph on their deterioration. Words, originally used in a good sense, have gradually lost their better meaning, and are now expressive of some obliquity in our moral nature. The depraved moral sense has fixed an unfortunate meaning on the word, and the word has reacted on the sense, and thus morals and language mutually help each other in a downward course. Jeremy Taylor says: "Sadness is sometimes an index of a pious mind, of compassion, and a wise and proper *resentment* of things." Now we resent an injury, but never a kindness. In Dryden's preface to the Hind and the Panther, he says: "The king expects that the kindness, which he has graciously shown them, may be *retaliated* on those of his own persuasion. Now, we uniformly retaliate wrongs, but never a benefit. And what a proof have we of the disposition of children to soil what is neat and clean, when Gascoigne, in his De Profundis could write:

> "O Israel, O household of the Lord,
> O Abraham's brats, O brood of blessed seed."

The word cunning has passed through the same change. It is one of the many words in our tongue, which have deteriorated in meaning. It is derived from the Saxon cunnan, to know, and originally was used in our language in the sense of knowledge, art, or skill. Spenser has the line:

> "An altar carved with cunning imagery;"

and in the Taming of the Shrew 2 : 1, Petruchio says:

> "I do present you with a man of mine,
> Cunning in music, and the mathematics"

Now, the almost uniform use of the word, is in the sense of artifice, or dissimulation. How sadly must learning have been prostituted to the accomplishment of bad purposes, and how useless many learned men have been in the world, that the very word for knowledge, should come to mean decep-

tion. The word is a witness forever, that learning and piety, wisdom and goodness, do not necessarily accompany each other. The historical expression of the word *cunning* is, Learning is fraud. The word *ken*, is from the same source, and is now narrowed in meaning, and restricted to knowledge obtained by sight. Previous to the eighteenth century, it retained the broad meaning of knowledge of any kind. Addison uses the expression: "We *ken* them from afar." In Troilus and Cressida, when Ulysses recognizes Diomed, he says:

> "Tis he, I *ken* the manner of his gait;
> He rises on the toe; that spirit of his
> In aspiration lifts him from the earth."

Tennyson has more than once used the common word *unked*, formerly a provincialism in the north of England. Even Cowper, in one of his letters, has the sentence: "Weston is sadly unked without you," *i. e.*, strange, awkward, solitary. The word is unquestionably connected with *cunnan*. The same may be affirmed of *canny* and *canniness*, now most frequently heard among the Scotch as colloquialisms. In some portions of England, they are used in the sense of learned, while in other portions, they are applied to a low prudence, and roguish sagacity, yet everywhere retaining the leading idea of the root. In Yorkshire, the quality of *canniness* attributed to a person, would be in the highest degree offensive; but in Northumberland, in the highest degree complimentary; so true is it, that "in spite of disturbing and distracting causes, the English language is more emphatically one in America, than in its native land; and if we have engrafted on our mother-speech some wide-spread corruptions, we have very nearly freed the language, in our use of it, from some vulgar and disagreeable peculiarities, exceedingly common in England." The words *unkent* and *uncouth* may be traced to the same source as those mentioned above. The former is now obsolete, though used as late as the seventeenth century by Sir Thomas Browne, in the Urn Burial: "The swain unkent." *Uncouth* has passed through a most significant change. Originally synonymous with unknown, it now means

boorish or clumsy, and is most frequently applied to persons. In Spenser's day, an *uncouth* person was an unclerkly, or an ignorant one. Demetrius exclaims in Titus Andronicus: "I am surprised with an uncouth fear," and Orlando, in As You Like It, says to his servant Adam: "If this *uncouth* forest yield any thing savage, I will either be food for it, or bring it for food to thee." The ignorant, uneducated person of the sixteenth century, is the clownish one of the nineteenth. The underlying thought in the change of this word is, that inward deformity expresses itself outwardly in the body. The want of mental culture is apparent in the eye, the tongue, the whole gait. The body may be but a lump of clay, the soul speaks through it, and the dimmed eye, the thickened tongue, the bleared, bloated countenance, and the palsied limbs are but the outward expressions of a depraved soul. True Christian culture affects even the body, and its natural result is not a brilliant foppishness, or a necessarily polished exterior, but genuine refinement of manners. The soul shines through the man.

Thus from the grammatical and etymological examination of this clause, by no means an exhaustive examination, it is obvious that the materials for the detailed study of our language are abundant and interesting. Yet, there may be such an absorbing attention to the words, that the underlying thought is neglected. Mere word-study may be very unprofitable. It is too apt to beget conceit and pedantry. Word-hunters are proverbially one-sided, eccentric characters. In addition, something must be done to relieve the monotony of the grammar and dictionary. The energies must not be wholly expended, nor the attention wearied, in devotion to grammatical and etymological peculiarities. This may be one reason why, at the beginning of our classical studies we are so little impressed by the beauties of Virgil, or the loftiness of Homer. No doubt the view from the eminence is rich and broad, but the climber has spent so much time and severe toil in reaching the summit, that he is too late and too tired to enjoy the scenery, and on coming down, he tells his friends that after all, "the great thing is the exercise." Not

many classical students are disposed to break out in raptures over the eloquence of Demosthenes, or the fine philosophy of Plato. So true is this, that sometimes whole pages are read, and the mind not at all affected by the richest imagery, or the loftiest speculations which antiquity has bequeathed to us. The mental habit thus formed, is transferred to our own tongue, and frequently the classical scholar will find himself running over successive pages of the choicest thought in the most mechanical manner. An unappreciative familiarity with what is beautiful and true and good, deadens the powers, and blunts the sensibilities. Hence, the minute examination of a passage should uniformly be followed by the question: "What is the thought? What does the author mean." Let it be remembered, it is *thought* that is quickening, and the power to be gained in a course of education, is the power of thinking. This power, however gained, is worth more than whole encyclopædias of aggregated scientific and linguistic information. If the passage for study be from Julius Cæsar:

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and miseries."

the student should be called upon for the thought—the rhetorical form—the grammatical equivalent—illustrations of the truth. And occasionally large portions should be assigned for examination and reading, the Allegro, or Penseroso, or Comus of Milton, a Canto of Spenser, or several hundred lines of Chaucer. You thus avoid the conceits of mere word-hunting, the narrowness resulting from the exclusive study of grammatical quibbling, and make the mind of the student familiar with large portions of our literature.

We are aware of the leading difficulty in pursuing this method of faithful study. There is not enough of the railroad and telegraph life about it. It is too plodding for the spirit of the age and of the country. It is too slow for us

hasty Americans. All the attractions which the oldest university can offer to our youth, are scarcely sufficient to retain them the usual time in the College course, and they have done their life-work, and are ready to retire, at an age when the German student has fairly begun his educational career. This restlessness and impatience beget a superficiality, at variance with all solid scholarship. A teeming press produces a ravenous appetite, and volumes are consumed in a week. Would that in this unwise haste after palpable results and visible fruits, our students might weigh and practice the maxim of Prof. Davies: "It is better to know everything about something, than something about everything," or those equally weighty words found in a letter of that gifted man, F. W. Robertson: "I never knew but one or two fast readers, and readers of many books, whose knowledge was worth anything." Miss Martineau says of herself that she is the slowest of readers, sometimes a page an hour. Sir Erskine Perry said the other day that, in a conversation with Comte, one of the profound thinkers of Europe he told him that he had read an incredibly small number of books these last twenty years; but then what Comte reads lies there fructifying, and comes out a living tree, with leaves and fruit. Multifarious reading is the idlest of all idleness, and leaves more of impotency than any other. I read hard, or not at all, never skimming, never turning aside to merely inviting books; and Plato, Aristotle, Butler, Thucydides, Sterne, Jonathan Edwards have passed like the iron atoms of the blood into my mental constitution."

ARTICLE VI.

REASON NOT A RULE OF FAITH.

By Rev. Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The Protestant Confessions generally agree in declaring the Bible to be the Christian's only rule of faith and practice. This harmony in regard to a great fundamental principle, might justly be expected to lead to a corresponding harmony in all that this principle is designed to determine and regulate. Objects which are measured by the same rule, may reasonably be supposed to agree with each other. But it is not thus among Christians. The diversity of creeds, and the ecclesiastical clashings and conflicts, are manifest facts, notwithstanding the general theoretical agreement in regard to the criterion by which all doctrines are to be tested.

This suggests the inquiry, whether other principles than that of the exclusive authority of the Bible may not be exerting their influence upon the minds and the practice of Christians, while their vigilance is relaxed. The present age displays no great degree of earnest zeal in contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Keeping the Lord's sayings in the heart, and meditating upon them, is not the prominent characteristic of the times. It is rather an age of work. The endeavor to accomplish something, and to do this with the greatest possible haste, is apparent to every observer. May it not be possible, that in the hurrying to and fro in the performance of what seems important labor for the Master, the Master's will is sometimes overlooked, and the divine rule of discipleship is disregarded? There is cause, in the present condition of the churches, for starting the inquiry. There is often dangerous formalism where it is least suspected.

The divisions and distractions existing in the visible household of God, are painfully felt by many, and thousands are sighing for deliverance from a condition which is in opposition to the will of our Lord, an impediment to the prosecution of the Church's work, and a source of grief to the hearts of so many Christians. While some, in palpable violation of Christ's express command and in open antagonism to the Christian consciousness, advocate the expediency of divisions among us, others ardently long to see the whole company of believers stand united before the world as one body. But while the former confess themselves to be influenced by the consideration, that the existence of different denominations, upon the principle of emulation, tends to inspire all with a greater zeal in good works, the latter frequently subject themselves to the charge of being actuated by motives of an equally utilitarian character, and of equally disregarding the Lord's will as revealed in the Scriptures, even though the result should seem coincident with His purpose. So far as the desire for union is originated and regulated by the word of God, which is our only rule, it cannot have for its end the attainment of temporal advantages or personal benefits, and cannot be sundered from an equally ardent desire to secure a union that is pleasing to Him. It cannot be the Christian's legitimate aim to effect an external association, whether the will of the Lord be done or not. God's children would declare their unity, because they are one; their purpose cannot be, by outwardly uniting, to effect a seeming union among those who are not one, because the Lord commands unity. The semblance is not what is enjoined and should be desired, but the reality. The substitution of man's "common sense" for the only rule, is mischievous, Common sense, usurping the place of revelation, is common nonsense. Though the external association might be thought to accomplish some of the ends for which Christian union, on the basis of unity in faith, was commanded; though it might seem especially to exhibit to the world the unifying power of divine truth over against the distracting weakness of human error; the nature of the case suggests, and experience has established, that the veil of ex-

ternal union is too thin to conceal the internal disharmony. Thus the well-meant design of commending Christianity by presenting a united host to the world, is baffled by departing from the only true standard; and the wily foe of the Church raises the cry of hypocrisy against her, for pretending to be what she manifestly is not. The very weapon with which mistaken men would achieve a victory for the Church is thus turned against her with damaging force. The more closely and strictly we abide by the word of the Lord, the better it will be for the cause of Christianity, which is specifically the cause of revealed truth.

Nothing could be more salutary, in these busy times, than an earnest application to practice of the principle, that the Bible alone must be our standard and guide. "If ye continue in my word," says our blessed Lord, "then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8 : 31—32. In adherence to the Lord's words we have the condition of discipleship stated by the Lord himself, and the confession of this word is, therefore, the only safe mark by which disciples are to be recognized.

It is true that the errors and consequent divisions which afflict the Church could not all be healed by the sincere adoption and zealous application of this principle. The Bible itself assures us that "there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." 1 Cor. 11 : 19. There will be dishonest men in spite of all that honest men can do. There will, undoubtedly, always be those who will not hesitate to make the confession which the Bible requires, while their hearts reject the truth which is confessed. The mark of discipleship is not one by which we can infallibly ascertain who the true disciples are. In the nature of the case, we can have no such infallible test, because faith is invisible, and its visible fruits can be more or less successfully imitated. But if the divine criterion does not secure us against imposition, Christians should have no difficulty in perceiving that human inventions

can accomplish that end still less, and that their introduction can only engender strifes and multiply troubles.

The Bible is extolled among Christians of every name, and this is a source of joy to those who believe in the Lord Jesus as their only Saviour from sin and death. Its honor as a book of divine revelation is manfully defended against the assaults of wicked men, who know not what they do. But the zeal of Christians generally for the preservation, in all its integrity, of the truth which it contains, does not keep pace with their solicitude to have the volume recognized as the treasury containing it. Attention is directed more to the form, than to the matter of the sacred word. Formalism is not confined to the Romish Church, nor to the Churches which are thought to exhibit it in the domain of the cultus. It is found sometimes where the efforts seem to be directed mainly to the cultivation of a more profound spirituality. As there are those who desire external union for its own sake, that is, the form and semblance of union, without troubling themselves about the internal unity in faith, without which it is a mere sham, so there are those who labor to produce those external fruits which grow upon the tree of true spiritual life, without devoting much attention to the question, whether that life really exists, without which they are a mere pretense—whether they are not merely wooden apples tied on dead branches. There may be as much formalism in an excited prayer-meeting, at which some lovers of vital piety are delighted, as in a calm ritualistic service, at which they are disgusted. The Christian life may manifest itself in the form of a glowing extemporaneous prayer, or in that of a quiet supplication read from a book; but where there is no Christian life, both are mere forms. Our taste is not the criterion by which we are to judge. All charges of formalism are mere manifestations of an uncharitable spirit, when there is no proof of the absence of Christian life, or when the only proof of such absence is the distastefulness of the form to the person making the charge. The word of the Lord must be our rule.

The doctrine of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture is, in some cases, rendered nugatory by an abandonment of the doctrine, that these Scriptures are perspicuous, and that faith involves certainty. Many despair of ever bringing about an agreement among Christians upon the biblical principles of the Reformation. Some being tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, and longing for some solid ground upon which to place their feet, are driven to seek rest in papal infallibility, which cuts the perplexing knot; others renounce Christianity entirely as a failure, hoping to find peace by smothering the cries of the soul; while a third, and perhaps by far the larger class, quiet themselves by ecclesiastical assurances that all distinctive doctrines forming boundary lines between professing Christians, are indifferent, and that the true rule and norm of faith and practice, is general agreement. The fact which the word of God so clearly teaches, and which experience so loudly proclaims, that the soul never can find peace while it leans upon man, and that the cry of "peace, peace, when there is no peace," quiets no troubled conscience, and affords no joyful hopes, is all the while overlooked. A more careful consideration of the great principle of the Reformation might convince such despairing souls, who are exchanging the delicious viands spread before them in the Word, for the miserable husks of human assertions and pretensions, that the Bible alone is a guide that is sure and safe, and that difficulties which its adoption does not obviate, never can be removed in this world of sin. A return to the old paths is the only remedy for the great evils which are upon us. The true light to guide us through the intricacies of this nineteenth century, is that which shone so brightly and rendered the path of the just so plain in the sixteenth.

The profession and the practice of Christians are frequently at variance; and the suspicion is oftentimes justly aroused, that the Bible is not the only rule of faith adopted even where all others are in theory rejected. There are sometimes errors admitted into the mind which conflict with the theory accepted, and result in a practice which involves its rejection; and there is sometimes a practice admitted which

can legitimately result only from an antagonistic theory, even while the principle from which it springs, is rejected, and the opposite is adopted. To bring before the consciousness what is involved in the recognition of the Bible as the only authority in the sphere of the spiritual, it is necessary to exhibit, in their erroneousness, the substitutes for it which are frequently accepted, whether consciously or unconsciously, as well as to show the sufficiency of the Scriptures as the Christian's norm. A small part of this task is undertaken in the present article.

Appeals have been made, for the purpose of establishing propositions claimed to be articles of faith, or of refuting statements put forth as declarations of the divine will, to other authority than that of the Scriptures which are given by inspiration of God. In some cases these appeals have been justified by directly claiming authority for the criterion to which the appeal is made; in others, there has been a tacit assumption of such authority, without expressly asserting the claim. In either case the confession is made, whether in word or deed, that the Bible is not the only judge that, in matters of faith, can decide the question or end the strife. Some maintain that reason must have a voice in every question affecting the welfare of man, whether temporally or eternally; and many who would hesitate to maintain that its authority is co-ordinate with that of the Bible, use its dictates as a standard by which to test the doctrines of revelation. Some claim that there is a touch-stone of truth in the sensibilities of man, which must ultimately decide what is to be accepted as God's revelation; and many who would be slow expressly to countenance the doctrine of such an authoritative "inner light" in the feelings or fancy, are always ready, when a doctrine is set forth which is distasteful to them, to reject it upon the authority of such an inner judge. Some regard the human conscience as the permanent abode of the Deity, whence he constantly announces his infallible decisions, with which no revelation can be in conflict; and many who would shrink from deifying any human power in theory, appeal to conscience in questions decided by the written rev-

élation, as if its voice were supreme. Some, with a high regard for those whom the Lord has sent forth to preach the everlasting gospel, insist that their voice must determine what is required of Christians; and many who would not expressly claim that ministers are infallible, accept, without questioning their authority, the doctrines and decisions of the pastors. Some boldly teach and confess, that there is another fountain of divine truth unto salvation, besides the Bible, placing apostolic tradition, by its side, as an equally valid rule and criterion, and practically even subordinating the written word to the oral communication; and many who are not professed papists, resort to the utterances of men of the olden times, as if they were inspired. Some assume that the Church, as she is represented in Synods and Councils, is endowed with the power of determining what God would have us believe and do; and many who have not thought of maintaining that Synods are inspired, or possess infallibility by a special direction of the Holy Spirit, rest content to accept their declarations, and submit the conscience to their control, as if their voice were, necessarily, the voice of the Lord, whatever the Scriptures might say. Some substitute the Symbols of the Church for the book of truth, maintaining that the inspired volume can be rightly understood only when the student is guided by the Creed of Christians; and many assume that a doctrine must be true, because their Church teaches it, without taking the trouble to inquire whether their Church's teaching be coincident with that of the Bible or not. That all such appeals are entirely unwarranted, and incalculably prejudicial to the cause of truth, should be plain to every believer in divine revelation, inasmuch as they all disparage the only rule of faith.

That there is a natural tendency, in man, to be a rule unto himself, is known to all from experience. Ever since the fall has estranged him from God, the supreme Ruler, he would be an autocrat. Pride is his predominant impulse. He readily submits, indeed, to slavery. But he is a bundle of contradictions, that cannot be understood by an application of ab-

stract logical laws. The disposition to lord it over all, would seem to conflict with the tendency to cringe before every usurper. But he was created to serve, not to reign, and to possess liberty and happiness in his service; and when he rebelled against the Monarch of all, and declared his independence, it was to become a slave to the master of misery, at whose instigation the rebellion was undertaken, though that master moved his victim by the enticing lie that the servile work would render him free, so the he would be as God, and become his own lord. The satanic lie succeeded, and men believe it still. Absolute self-government is the theory which is built upon it. But the fact is not changed by the delusion which conceals it. In the inmost recesses of the soul, there is an inscription which tells of the creature's subjection to the Creator, and which, with all man's efforts to convince himself of his own supremacy, will sometimes obtrude itself upon his sight. He would, therefore, domineer over all, pursuant to the claim which he bases upon satan's promise, and yet, in his actual subjection to the devil, in compliance with his feeling that obedience is due to some superior power, he is prone, in a cowardly spirit, to submit to any bold being who would domineer over him. He would be an autocrat, and, if he cannot be this, he will be a slave, as he has renounced allegiance to the only true ruler, whom it is liberty to serve.

As, among the faculties of the human mind, reason stands pre-eminent, this faculty is most frequently regarded as the source and seat of man's authority. In his normal condition it regulates the desire and affections, as well as the volitions, and holds the reigns of government over the conduct. To pronounce a thought, or feeling, or action, unreasonable, is to condemn it. Within the domain of the natural, its authority is undisputed. The whole condition of man is abnormal when any other power usurps the throne. He who is carried away by passion, is universally regarded as censurable, and he who wills and works in disregard of reason's requirements, is noted only for his folly. It is the eye of the soul, and those who walk without exercising it, are advancing blindly

toward certain ruin. It was manifestly designed to sway the sceptre among our natural powers, and every effort to disparage it, only manifests the unreasonableness of him who makes it. It is one of God's most noble gifts, and true piety will prize it, and bless its Giver for the bountiful gift. There is wretched anarchy in the soul, when it ceases to reign. Supreme wretchedness would be our lot if reason were dethroned.

But reason is honored when it confines itself to its own realm; it brings itself into disrepute, when it presumes to exercise authority in domains that lie beyond its jurisdiction. It is no disparagement to a monarch, when his right to sway his sceptre over another's dominions is denied; those who are wisely zealous for his honor, will be most anxious to secure him against the obloquy of any attempt to transcend his powers. Reason is royal in its own dominions; it is contemptible when it arrogates to itself sovereignty where it has neither the right nor the capacity to rule.

Rationalism, which is the theoretical co-ordination of reason and revelation, but the practical subordination of the latter to the former, is not a new system, which made its first appearance in the elaborate form which it assumed among the German philosophers of the last century. It is, in fact, as old as the race. The heathens indulged in subtle speculations upon religion, as well as the Jews and Christians; and the early ages of Christianity had their Gnostics, and the middle ages their Scholastics, as well as these latter days have their Rationalists. The theory is, in all cases, substantially the same. The human mind is assumed to have all the materials and powers, within itself, for the attainment of comfort on earth and blessedness in heaven; and the inference from this assumption is, that if a revelation has been vouchsafed to us, this must be in harmony with the prior revelation given in the human mind, because the latter was certainly bestowed by the Creator, and the former, as coming from the same infallible, and therefore unchangeable, source, cannot be in conflict with it: any inconsistency between the two, would be positive proof that the written record is a fabrica-

tion. It is further assumed that, the consistency between the revelation in nature as recognized by the reason, and that given in language being admitted, the postulates of reason, and the logical deductions from data given in nature, must furnish a standard for the interpretation of the language in which the later revelation is communicated. In this way many who admit the Bible to be the book of God, still claim that reason must have a voice in determining what must be believed as divine truth, while others practically adopt the principle, without any clear consciousness of the theory underlying their practice. The result is, either the rejection of the Bible, in whole or in part, as false, because its statements are not in harmony with the interpreter's reason, or the resort to unnatural and utterly unjustifiable methods of interpretation, in order to force a harmony which is supposed not to exist if the words be taken in this obvious sense. In either case, the word of God is rejected, whether the form of words be retained or not.

In order to exhibt the error of adopting reason as a rule, in matters of revelation, it will be necessary to ascertain clearly what is meant by the term, and what is the limit within which the faculty, so denominated, may legitimately claim authority.

The term is often used so vaguely, that it is not an easy matter precisely to apprehend its signification. To say that it is the power, in virtue of which man is distinguished from the brute, leaves it undetermined what that power is. As employed in the question before us, it is, no doubt, ordinarily intended to designate the powers of cognition generally, together with the knowledge which nature furnishes. It thus embraces the intuitive faculties, with their acquisitions, and the discursive faculties, with their products. The testimony of sense and consciousness, as well as of that more recondite faculty by which we have intuitions of necessary truths, and to which the term reason is frequently limited by philosophers, is adduced as decisive proof in questions which lie, or are suppesed to lie, within their sphere; and the inferences derived from such intuitions, are appealed to as equally au-

thoritative and equally valid as evidence. The faculties employed in the acquisition of knowledge, whether directly or indirectly, are regarded as the faculties of reason, and their operations and results, as the voice of reason. The limitation of the term to the powers of reasoning, that is, of immediate, or mediate inference, is, so far as those are concerned who make reason a rule of faith, merely apparent; for when an appeal is made to reason as a norm, that which assumes to be normative, is never the fundamental law of thought, but always the knowledge attained by the exercise of the intellect. This, even though it be an inference, always implies the reception of natural intuitions as the sources of all truth. It is reason, not in its formal operations, but in its material contents, that is meant, when it is represented as a reliable rule by which even revelation must be tested.

This will enable us to obtain a clear view of the actual point of controversy. Those who contend for the Bible alone as the rule of faith, do not dispute the general trust-worthiness of the intellectual faculties. God has not made our minds to delude us with falsehoods. We are so constituted that we cannot, without doing violence to our intellectual nature, and thus wantonly working ourselves into despair of all truth, refuse to credit our intuitions. What the soul perceives through the senses, is at once believed to exist, and to possess the qualities which are perceived. The idealistic philosophy, which denies the existence of external objects, and which, because it seems to escape the great speculative difficulty of bridging over the chasm between mind and matter, has many adherents, satisfies but few; indeed, it is very questionable whether it has ever satisfied a single soul. After all its philosophizing, the mind, whatever may have been its speculative results, falls back upon its original belief that things exists as they are perceived. These books, those trees, are realities: it is characteristic of insanity to confound them with the phantoms of the brain. The testimony of the senses, is accepted just as fully by those who maintain that the Bible alone must be our guide in spiritual things, as by those who would claim this honor for reason. That the

senses sometimes deceive us, will, no doubt, be admitted by both alike; it is one of the imperfections incident to our fallen state. That they are generally reliable, is, in virtue of our organization, the settled belief of both. The same is true of the other intuitions. It is impossible that we should be conscious of mental operations which have no existence; or, if this were possible, it certainly is impossible that we should believe them not to exist. We may forget; we may suppose a thought or feeling, which presents itself now, to have appeared in our consciousness at some past time, just as we may suppose ourselves to have seen an object before, which lies before our eyes now for the first time; but we cannot believe, even if we would, that a mental operation, of which we are conscious now, is not taking place, just as we cannot believe that the house before us is not there. Nor is it otherwise with the intuitions of reason, in the strict sense of that word. That space and time exist, and that material substances require the one, and actions require the other, as conditions of their existence; that there are such things as right and beauty, and that the mind judges in accordance with these intuitions: this cannot be gainsaid. They are facts of universal experience, the denial of which is self-stultification. The ideas and axioms of reason, are recognized by all, whatever differences might result from differences in their application. We cannot avoid admitting that the whole is greater than a part, and that two material bodies cannot occupy the same space, however strong might be our desire to withhold our assent. The question at issue is, therefore, not at all, whether our intuitions are reliable, and whether we would, accordingly, be warranted in regarding them as safe starting-points for our judgments. As regards this, there is no controversy.

Neither does the dispute turn upon the inquiry, whether our intellectual faculties may be legitimately used in the investigation of spiritual matters. Those who insist that the Bible alone is authority in this domain, do not discard reason or reject its legitimate authority. The word of God is addressed to the senses, appears in the consciousness, and is a

proper object for the activity of our discursive faculties. If we could not trust the eye and the ear, which read and hear the word, we could never possess the saving truth with certainty. It enters the mind through the ordinary avenues, which God has so created that they are trustworthy. If our consciousness deceived us with regard to our cognitions and our mental operations, we could be assured neither of our possession of the gospel which the word conveys, nor of the existence in our hearts of that faith which alone appropriates it and makes the salvation ours. It is present to us in our consciousness, like any other mental acquisition, and this faculty does not delude us. If our rational intuitions were discarded, all theology as a science would be impossible, and all deductions from plain truths of revelation would be nugatory. Not only is it lawful and expedient to use the powers of the mind upon religious subjects, and to recognize their efficiency in their proper office, but it is necessary to do this if we would have the benefits which revelation is designed to confer. He cannot have the saving truth at all who will not have it pass into his soul through the ordinary avenues, and thus present itself to his consciousness, and he will have it but imperfectly who will not think upon it and be governed in his thinking by the laws which reason furnishes. So far, then, the case is plain and the ground is undisputed.

But this by no means exhausts the subject. Those who claim normal authority for reason in spiritual matters, would either reject all revelation as unnecessary, because reason furnishes all that is requisite, or, admitting that a revelation has been given, subject it to the postulates and decisions of reason, as the primal and chief authority. The first of these positions it is not our purpose here to examine, as we write for those who recognise the Bible as a revelation from God, and lay claim to the name of Christians. It would lead us too far from our object even to give a brief view of the argument against the Deists. It is the second that we desire to consider.

The theory that reason is the norm for testing revelation is unreasonable. It assumes that truth in the higher sphere to which revelation pertains is subject to the same laws and con-

ditions as that which pertains to the lower. It makes the assumption not only without a shadow of proof, but in opposition to all analogy. As it would be unreasonable to test the correctness of the testimony of our senses by our antecedent rational convictions, thus explaining facts away by assuming their impossibility, so it would he unreasonable to test the testimony of revelation by such supposedly rational ideas, and explain them away in order not to be compelled to relinquish preconceived opinions. If an inhabitant of a warm climate, who never saw water congealed into ice, should, on hearing the statement for the first time that it becomes so solid in this country that wagons are driven across the surface of our rivers, reject the statement as a falsehood which is palpable, or, admitting the credibility of the witness, should explain the statement in coincidence with his own convictions on the subject, his unreasonableness would at once be admitted. But is it any less irrational to assume that the divine testimony, which refers to a domain lying beyond our earthly ken, must mean something else than that which the language declares, because what is said is not in coincidence with our previous experiences and convictions? And if the Bible sometimes makes statements which seem in conflict with necessary truths of reason, is it reasonable to assume, without proof, that what could not be accepted as truth in the relation in which things are viewed in our present condition, must be equally objectionable in other relations and in another condition? It is ofttimes asserted that the dignity of man requires his unyielding maintenance of the primacy of reason over all. But is it at all in accordance with the dignity of man to put forth the arrogant claim that heaven and earth contain nothing which lies beyond the reach of his philosophy, and of which he is not a competent judge? Even in earthly things man makes himself ridiculous by presuming to pronounce judgment in matters which he does not understand, and by applying tests which are very good in their place, but which are inapplicable where they are used. The man may think himself wondrous wise who is not to be duped by any such statement, as that five hundred miles are traveled

in a single day, or messages are sent that distance in a few moments, when it requires a day to visit his nearest market town, and a week to carry a letter to his brother in a neighboring State; but his wisdom only renders him an object of ridicule to those for whom he thinks himself too sharp. The men who are the most reasonable are those who are not disposed to presume too much upon their rational powers, but wisely confess their ignorance in matters which they do not understand, and humbly learn of those who do understand them. The Bible was given us for the very reason that we need light on the subjects of which it treats, and it is an unreasonable abuse of reason to make what we know of this earthly sphere the criterion by which to measure the truth of that which pertains to a domain that is wholly different.

A distinction must be made between the powers of reason as it is constituted by nature, and the application of these powers in actual practice. It is not true, as has already been indicated, that there may be a conflict between the teaching of nature and that of revelation; for as God made the one and gave the other, they cannot be asserted to be inconsistent with each other without impeaching the unchangeableness of Jehovah. But man may err with regard to both, and thus find seeming inconsistencies which are not such in reality. They are in the mind, not in the objects which it contemplates, and concerning which it judges. So far as reason extends it is reliable. But it extends not to the things of which we receive our knowledge, not by nature but by revelation. The contradictions which some profess to find between the two sources of knowledge, result from an abuse of reason, and never occur when reason is used in accordance with its own design and principles, any departure from which is just as unreasonable as the effort to distinguish sounds by the eye or colors by the ear. It is folly to deny the existence of objects which appear in the broad light of day because they were invisible in the twilight, or to maintain that nature must appear in the torrid zone precisely as it appears in the frigid. Our philosophical axioms, true as we cannot help

regarding them in reference to transitory things which are seen around us here, need not be true when applied to things of whose laws reason gives us no information. When we affirm that the multiplication of persons involves the multiplication of essences, we assert a law of earthly things; and when the Scriptures teach that there are three divine Persons and but one divine Essence, there seems to be a contradiction. But this is not with reason as such. It is simply with reason as abusively applied. The error lies in attempting to measure the infinite and divine by a rule which applies only to the finite and created, much as if a law applicable to bats were used as a standard for judging of eagles. The law is reasonable in its own domain; it is unreasonable when used as a criterion of things beyond that domain. The eagle's lofty soaring and clear vision are not in contradiction with reason, though they undoubtedly are with the irrational reasoning of him who denies all flight and sight above the bat's to be impossible. If it be said that nothing can come from nothing, all will readily admit it when the rule is applied to the process of generation; but when it is applied to creation it becomes as irrelevant and irrational as when the highest known speed of the snail is taken as the standard of all possible celerity of motion. The absurdity lies not at all in the nature of reason, but in the unreasonableness of those who misapply it. That there are very foolish people does not prove reason to be very foolish; it only proves that they largely lack the faculty. The truth of revelation will seem falsehood to the rationalist who irrationally applies the criterion which is proper to one subject, to another which is different, or which is proper to a subject in one condition or respect, to the same subject in a different condition or respect. That a human person cannot be present in different places at the same time, is very evident; but to assert that the human nature of our blessed Lord cannot be present with His disciples at more than one place in the same moment is most unphilosophical as well as entirely unscriptural; because this human nature is not such a human person as that contemplated by the axiom, since the humanity of Jesus is assumed into the

unity of the person of the Son of God, which is divine, not human: the person of our Lord is not at all subject to the laws governing human persons. The contradictions claimed to exist between revelation and reason will, in all cases, be found to be apparent contradictions arising from a misapplication of rational intuitions, or, in other words, they are not contradictory to reason, but only to the unreasonable assumptions of erring men. Reason has its own limits, and in its own essence recognizes those limits. It is not hasty to apply tests, which it perceives to be perfectly reliable in the sphere with which it is acquainted, to new matter which may be subject to other laws as lying in another domain and existing under different conditions. And to claim for it supremacy over a Book which God has given us for the express purpose of enlightening us upon subjects which lie beyond our natural knowledge and our previous experience, betrays no philosophical acumen or soberness, as it certainly indicates no Christian meekness and reverence. Even if we could ascertain the dictates of pure reason, uninfluenced by the darkening and depraving power of the sin which has come upon all mankind, it would not be a rule by which revelation should be tested; for even then it would recognize its prescribed limits, and not, in overweening pride, presume to judge in matters which transcend its powers, and render decisions respecting these matters according to criteria which are applicable only to things belonging to the domain of the natural. If man were not a fallen being, reason would not be the presumptious power which it shows itself to be; and in this case it would not venture beyond its sphere, but confine itself to those things which lie within its capacity. On this ground it would never be contradicted by revelation. But in its present corrupt condition it is not content to remain within its originally prescribed limits, but arrogantly trenches on the domain of revelation; and the theory which makes it an authority in the realm of faith is simply a defense of its arrogance, the success of which would be the overthrow of Christianity. The disciples of Christ should stand together as one man to resist the usurper's encroachments; for, manifestly, it is not

the honor of reason which the theory maintains, but the right of subjecting revelation to its abuse.

Those who leave out of the account the sad effects of the fall upon the mental powers can never have a correct view of the rights of reason, and must stand in conflict with the word of God in the results which they reach on this point, as they start out with Pelagian premises which are at variance with all revelation, and subversive of the whole foundation upon which the glorious structure of Christianity rests. Let us heed what the Scriptures plainly teach us in regard to the present powers of reason.

That our minds are capable of knowing from nature some things which are stated in the Scriptures; that this knowledge, so far as it extends, is true; but that the results arrived at are most unhappy, appears, clearly, from St. Paul's words in Rom. 1, 18—25: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifested in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse; because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." The creation, not only in its adaptations of the minutest parts, but as a whole, suggests to the mind a Creator, whose power is declared in the mighty work before our eyes, whose goodness is displayed in the wonderful provisions made for the wants of

every creature, and whose righteousness is revealed in the punishments visited upon wrong. That there is a God, is proclaimed by all nature, and reason may hear and read the proclamation. This is a revelation of God, and the knowledge which it gives is not erroneous. Nature is not a false prophet; and the faculties by which we perceive its utterances are just as safe in this domain as in that of written revelation. But the specific truths of Christianity are not revealed at all in nature, and, therefore, reason cannot learn them from that source. The revelation given in nature, is but in part; it tells us nothing of the plan of salvation, which is not a part of nature and not subject to natural laws. So far as reason cognizes truth as given in nature, it has reliable knowledge; and with this the written word of God is never at variance. The eternal power and Godhead of the Creator is no less true because it is apprehended by the rational powers through the light of nature. Where the seeming conflict between reason and revelation begins, is just where reason is abused. Instead of worshiping God, who is a Spirit, and thus not seen, in spirit and in truth, men, under the guidance of benighted and perverted reason, subject him to natural laws, and change "the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like unto corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." With such reason revelation is most certainly in conflict. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against it; and this is by no means because men act reasonably, but because "professing themselves to be wise, they become fools." Those who would have a God to correspond with the requirements of natural laws, will generally form one according to the laws which regulate matter, as do the heathens in uncivilized lands: in the best case they will frame one according to the laws which govern the finite spirit of man, and thus fall into the more refined, but no less pernicious forms of idolatry which are in vogue in countries more advanced in civilization. While pure reason would recognize the difference between the Creator and the creature, and not seek to measure the former by the petty gauge applied to the latter, reason, blinded by the

fall, becomes foolish and vain, refusing to worship a God that is not its own creature. The result of the effort in this way to maintain the honor of reason and the dignity of man is the degradation depicted by St. Paul in the passage quoted. And still some, "professing themselves to be wise," would set up this perverted reason as the test by which to try the truth of revelation!

Reason is blind in spiritual matters, and cannot be our guide. This the Holy Spirit declares in other places besides that to which reference has already been made. "This I say, therefore," St. Paul writes, "and testify in the Lord, that ye walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart," Eph. 4 : 17,18. In these words it is plainly stated that in man's natural condition there is no saving knowledge of God and all his reason is incapable of attaining it. "Howbeit, then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods," Gal. 4 : 8. Reason renders men idolators, when it is left to seek God by its own light. The natural alienation from God, who is light and life, darkens the understanding. Men thus walk in the vanity of their minds because of the blindness of their heart. The whole soul is carnal. The lusts of the flesh are the ruling power, and the intellect, though created to exercise dominion over all the mental powers, is led captive by them. Men are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, on account of which the proper relations of the faculties to each other have been deranged and every faculty has become depraved. The apostle, speaking of men as dead in trespasses and sins, says: "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." The lusts of the flesh exercise lordship over the whole man, so that the desires of the flesh become the desires of the mind, and are fulfilled at its bidding. Therefore he admonishes Christians, who are delivered from abject slavery to blind ap-

petite and passion, "that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your minds." Eph. 4 : 22, 23. Our sinful nature renders reason the dupe of lust, and, therefore, our minds must be renewed, that the lust which has usurped dominion, may be dethroned and the Holy Spirit may give us light and guidance by his word. Reason cannot be trusted in things spiritual, because the deceitful lusts have corrupted it. Coincident with this is the declaration of St. Peter: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; as obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance." 1 Pet. 1 : 14, 15. This admonishes us not to fall back into the wretched condition in which our ignorant minds were in subjection to lust, which held supreme sway over us, but to gird up the loins of our minds in the freedom form the bondage of corruption wherewith the truth in Christ has made us free. The same apostle, therefore, points to the wicked lusts of man, as the medium through which false prophets introduce their "damnable heresies" into the mind, and to "the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ," which we can have only through the revelation given in the Bible, as the means by which we escape the pollutions of the world. He says: "When they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For, if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." 2 Pet. 2 : 18—20. That the flesh, which rules man in his natural condition, domineers also over the intellect, and brings all his powers into the bondage of corruption, is the uniform doctrine of Scripture. And to this reason,

which is under the control of deceitful lusts, misguided men would subject revelation!

That which is distinctive of Christianity, cannot, according to the clear teaching of Scripture, be known at all without the revelation given in the Bible. Man, with all his reason and his reasoning, is ignorant of it until revelation gives him light. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Matt. 11 : 27. If nature teaches the eternal power and Godhead, it does not teach the glorious plan of salvation by the Father's mission of his only Son, and that Son's vicarious atonement for the sins of all the world. Such knowledge is too high for natural reason; it cannot attain unto it. "Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 16 : 17. Most certainly this does not leave room for the groundless opinion that reason has all the necessary material by nature to qualify it for testing the truth of any thing proposed by revelation. It undeniably expresses the reverse, in unmistakeable terms, affirming that the truth in Jesus lies above the plane of nature and natural reason, and is not to be accepted, or rejected, according as it corresponds, or conflicts, with opinions formed of things upon that plane. Our knowledge is to be enlarged by the addition of heavenly truth unto salvation, of which natural reason is ignorant; and this new truth is subject to no corrections according to standards which apply only to a different domain, but is to be received upon divine authority, by faith alone, as God alone can give us information concerning things which are above this earth, and concerning their laws and conditions. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what

man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 2 : 9—14. No candid Christian mind can, after a careful reading of these statements, remain in doubt whether the apostle denies the authority of reason in matters of divine revelation. He not only expressly rejects such authority, but also shows its unreasonbleness. Just as another man cannot be a judge of my consciousness, so a human being cannot be a judge of the contents of the divine mind; and just as it would be absurd for another to test the truth of utterances with regard to the phenomena of my consciousness, by the phenomena of the material world, so it would be absurd for man to presume to judge the word of God by laws which regulate the things of earth. The natural man knows nothing of the things of God's Spirit; he cannot know them, because they are spiritually discerned, all the light which we can have respecting them, being conferred by the Spirit who does know them; the Holy Ghost alone teaches them; nay, they are even foolishness to him. But they are foolishness to him because he compares spiritual things with things that are earthly and natural, when the result cannot be otherwise than that they seem foolish, just as all statements respecting the mind seem foolish when tested by the laws which govern the body. Those who are wise, compare spiritual things with spiritual; then the foolishness ceases, and all is blissful harmony. When the folly is once committed of setting up reason as a standard of the truth of revelation, folly follows folly as the result, and all certainty and joyfulness of faith is at an end.

It is in this respect that the Scriptures speak of an opposition between reason and revelation; "for to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Rom. 8 : 6. The soul that is at enmity with God is not in a fit condition to apprehend God's truth, and cannot understand what is so far above its level, even if it would. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 1 Cor. 3 : 18, 19. The application of irrelevant canons to matter which is not understood, is certainly foolishness; and of such folly the inflated wisdom of this world, which would measure the infinite by man's feeble sense, is guilty. Such wise men must first become fools in their own eyes, and in the eyes of those who labor under the same fatuity, before they can be wise indeed. As long as they continue in their folly, there will necessarily be contradictions between the great truths of revelation and the pompous pretensions of their reason; just as the imbecile, who, knowing only of the light of his candle, applies its capacities as the criterion of all truth respecting the powers of luminous bodies, finds endless contradictions in the stories told him of the resplendent and all-pervading rays of the sun. When men set out with the self-conceited and stupid notion that the things which they know, and the laws with which they are acquainted, form the limits of all possibilities, they will find enough in the book of revelation, as they will find enough in the book of nature, which they will be constrained to reject as absurd: it is contradictory, not to the truth, but to the silly limits of truth arbitrarily fixed by self-conceited ignorance and unreasonable presumptuousness. Therefore the apostle warns us against the arrogance of reason: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. 2 : 8. And the same apostle also exhibits clearly the Christian course as distinguished from that of the men who boast of the powers of their own reason when he says: "Though we walk in the flesh, we do

not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringeth into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10 : 4, 5.

In view of these Scriptural teachings, it is deplorable that many of those who would be sincere followers of Jesus, so far give way to the allurements of Satan as to recognize the material authority of reason in the domain of revelation. That infidels do this, is easily accounted for. They will not have Christ to reign over them. But those who sit at Jesus' feet and believe in Him, could not do a more inconsistent thing than to permit the flesh to interfere, when the Saviour speaks to us the words of eternal life. They should reflect, that when they appeal to reason against a doctrine which is rejected by the denomination to which they belong, but which the words of Scripture teach, others may, with the same justice, appeal to the same authority to overthrow another doctrine which may seem to them to be absolutely necessary to the integrity of the Christian system. For example: when the presence of Christ's body in the Holy Supper is denied, notwithstanding the plain words that the gift imparted is His body, and this denial is based on the argument from reason, that a body cannot be present at more than one place at the same time, another may argue from reason against the doctrine of two natures in the one God-man, on the ground that this is impossible without blending the two natures into one, which will have neither a human nor a divine nature, but a compound of the two. The evil lies in the admission of a false principle, which cannot be limited in its operation to any one case at will. The same principle, which would justify one in his rejection of the doctrine of the exaltation of our Lord's humanity in virtue of the personal union, would justify another in rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the resurrection of the body, or of original sin, or of the imputation of Christ's merits for the sinner's justification. We cannot assume that reason has the right to decide

in questions of revelation, then assume that it has no right where its decision would prove inconvenient. If it be right for Zwingli to appeal to it against Luther, then it is equally right for Socinus to appeal to it against Zwingli, and for Strauss to summon it as a witness against them all. Christians should consider well what they do, when they practically renounce the principle that the Bible alone is our rule of faith, by resorting themselves to the very court, before which infidels would have the case of revelation tried, and before which any errorist can get a verdict in his favor as against revealed truth, because the court is corrupt, and hostile to that truth, in its corruption. The whole foundation of our faith is undermined by such an error, as one article after another would be found inconsistent with the postulates of reason, and all that would be left, would be a dreary natural theology, without any light from the world above us, and without any comfort for our heavy-laden souls. And if many who admit the false principle are yet, by a happy inconsistency, preserved from surrendering to the foe doctrines which seem to them essential to the Christian system, it is not amiss to warn them of the wiles of the devil, who would have them consistent rationalists, and who, if he cannot induce them to let slip the saving truth as inconsistent with reason, will endeavor to induce them to hold it simply because it seems reasonable, not because it is scriptural, and thus to accomplish his malicious end at last. For when faith is overthrown, whether it be in the object which is to be embraced upon the authority of revelation, or in the heart which is to embrace it, man's ruin is compassed. If we reject one passage of revelation because its contents seem unreasonable, and accept another because its contents are coincident with reason or "common-sense," that which the Scriptures term faith, and which alone saves the soul, has no place in the heart. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb. 11 : 1. When we accept what we see and reject what is not seen, though clearly testified by the Holy Ghost, we do not accept what we see upon the Holy Ghost's testimony; in other words we see some things, but we believe

nothing. "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." John 20 : 29. If the Holy Spirit's testimony is trusted at all, it cannot be rejected as insufficient when the thing testified seems not in accordance with natural reason. The Christian can be such only when he is willing to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Nor will it at all change the aspect of the case, to distinguish between reason as it is enlightened by the Gospel, and as it is blinded by nature. Materially, it cannot be an authority in either condition, because it is never perfectly freed from the influence of the flesh in this life, and is not competent to sit in judgment upon matters of revelation, if it were. Formally, it cannot be a criterion, because in this respect it merely decides in accordance with a standard given, and cannot itself be the standard, as this would be a material, not a merely formal use.

That believers are still subject to the flesh, and that this influences their judgement as well as their practice, no Christian should doubt. The Bible gives all the light upon the point that is necessary to remove all doubt, and our experience amply confirms its statements. "And I, brethren," says St. Paul, "could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ." 1 Cor. 3 : 1. And those persons whom he denominates carnal, and whom he rebukes for harboring divisions among them, are the same of whom he afterwards says that they are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in them. They are Christians who are represented as carnal. Nor is it only of the weak that such representations are made: the flesh still struggles for supremacy and leads to sinful thoughts in all. "I delight in the law of God, after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind." Rom. 7 : 22, 23. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal. 5 : 17. As the whole mind was depraved by the introduction of sin, the whole mind is influenced by it as long as it still exists in us, rendering reason an unsafe

guide in any question pertaining to spiritual things, as it is prejudiced against the truth by nature, and is often controlled by the sinfulness within us, when we think ourselves moved by the Spirit. It is Christians that are warned to "beware lest any man spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit," and that are admonished to "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," And even if reason did not stand under the corrupting influence of a fallen nature, in which, though the work of sanctification is in progress when the heart believes unto salvation, the flesh still lusts against the Spirit, it would not be a competent authority in regard to the spiritual matters which form the subject of revelation. For these lie in a higher sphere, to which it cannot reach; and the result of taking the matter of nature, which lies under the cognizance of reason, with the laws which reason discovers as regulating that matter, for a standard by which to judge of the truth of the matter which lies not in the domain of nature, but a knowledge of whose being and laws is supernaturally revealed, is the folly of which we have spoken in preceding pages. The matter of revelation is different from the matter of nature, and that which reason apprehends in the latter sphere can never be a criterion for judging the wholly different matter of the former. A material use of reason, that is, a use of reason which implies the application of the knowledge gained from natural sources as the test of the credibility of truths communicated from a domain to which the mind has not access except through revelation, is, therefore, absolutely to be eschewed by Christians, whether the reason be enlightened or not, as it is subversive of all revelation. If the enlightened mind appeals to the truth of revelation in spiritual matters, its very enlightenment precludes the appeal to the truth of natural knowledge in a question belonging to such spiritual matters. He that is truly enlightened, knows the limits of reason, and cannot think of making it an authority in a question which revelation decides. Reason is royal only in its own dominions; it becomes a base usurper when it presumes to rule in the dominions of faith, in which it can only render itself

contemptible by exhibiting its incapacity for the office which it usurps.

But there is a formal or instrumental use of reason, which is necessary in the higher realm of revelation as well as in the lower sphere of nature. This we have no desire to keep out of view. The Christian is not to consider himself exempt from thinking, just as little as to imagine that he can possess the truth gained by revelation, through any other channel than the ordinary ones of sense-perception. He hears and sees the word and the administration of the sacraments, and "faith cometh by hearing." But the hearing by which faith comes, itself comes "by the word of God." Rom. 10 : 17. We receive the saving truth by way of the same organs through which we apprehend natural things. But the things are different, and their knowledge rests upon the testimony of the Holy Ghost, as we cannot know them except through His communications. When events which another man saw are narrated to us, we hear or see the words which are the media through which a knowledge of them is imparted. Our senses are as necessary to apprehend them at second hand as they would have been to see them directly, had we been present when they occurred. But the things themselves which are narrated are such as come under the cognizance of sense directly. The things of God's Spirit are not so. No human eye has seen them; the Holy Spirit reveals them. They can be known only by such revelation; and we must either receive them by faith as truths lying altogether beyond our natural knowledge, we reject the whole domain in which they lie, and confine ourselves to that of nature where reason rules. That our hearing is necessary to apprehend the Divine truth, as the natural organ through which the revealed truth is communicated, is something wholly different from maintaining that the truths communicated lie open to our natural view without revelation, or that they are subject to the same laws by which we test communications respecting things which do lie within the scope of our reason. Moreover, the laws of thought remain the same, whether the object of thought be matter given in nature or imparted by revelation.

When the premises are true and the argument valid, the conclusion will be true also, and this just as certainly when the matter of the premises lies in the field of revelation, as when it lies in the field of nature. But whether the premises be true, is not decided in both cases by the same test. Reason must decide in the one, revelation in the other. A logical conclusion drawn from an inspired proposition is also part of God's word, because God's words are true in their full import; all that they express and all that they imply is true, as He knew their whole import when He spake them, though man does not always know the whole import of His propositions.

Reason is, therefore, to be regarded as an important instrument of truth, and reason is most befitting the Christian, whose delight is the word of his Lord. But taking the data from the Bible and evolving their contents is one thing, and taking the data from nature and drawing inferences respecting things above nature, is another. Meditating upon God's word is worthy of the child of God; doing away with God's word, or presuming to correct it, or to modify it, upon the plea that our meditations upon nature require this, is doing despite to the Spirit and bringing ruin upon the soul. Reason is not the source whence our knowledge of divine things is to be derived; it is only the instrument for apprehending what God graciously reveals. The office of reason, in the sphere of saving truth, is to apply the rule which God gives, and not to set itself up as a rule by which to measure God's own rule. Not man's voice, as uttered in reason, is the standard of truth, but God's voice as given in revelation. God rules, not man; and in the Bible alone he speaks the words of salvation.

ARTICLE VII.

THE RELATION OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL TO THE CHURCH.

By Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, A. M., Whitemarsh, Pa., Editor of "The Lutheran Sunday-School Herald."

The Church of our Lord Jesus Christ is the spiritual kingdom of heaven on the earth. It is a divine institution, and was designed to embrace and represent all that is morally excellent in the world. We should accustom ourselves to view everything promotive of good in its proper relation to the church. By this method we shall be on our guard against the great error of under-estimating the church itself, and of divorcing *from* the church, either theoretically or practically, any enterprise that may contemplate the spiritual elevation of human beings. That there is danger of such error, we have only too much evidence in that tendency in our nature to plan and operate, for human advancement, without a due reference to God's method of grace. Thus have a thousand inventions of men encouraged the natural disposition of the heart to evade the offence of the cross, and to render null and void the claims of "the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." By well considering the Sunday-school in its true relation to the church, we shall attain to a clearer view of the mutual bearing of the one upon the other, and of the important practical questions therewith associated. Although the Sunday-school is generally very deservedly popular, and is now a highly important sphere of Christian activity, it is still in a state of development, and it seems as though its true position in the church has scarcely yet been thoroughly defined. It surely cannot be time mis-

spent that is taken up in trying to make this relation clearer to our understanding, and to deepen and extend our convictions of duty.

In analyzing this subject, let it be observed that:

I. The Sunday-school, as regards its Origin, bears to the Church the Relation of an *Outgrowth* of the latter.

It must not be forgotten that the Sunday-school is not the church. The church was directly and distinctly instituted and established by its Divine Head; while the Sunday-school, as such, was not. Thus viewed, there is an impropriety manifest, and a danger to be apprehended, as may be observed, for instance, in an oft-heard expression of some, when speaking affectionately of the Sunday-school: namely, "The Children's church." The children *have*, indeed, in common with their elders, a church in the one, true church of Christ; but outside of that they have *none*, It is not true that there is one church exclusively for adults and another exclusively for the children; and it is not right that we should permit ourselves, even in the most incidental way, to confuse the minds of the young by leaving the impression that in some way there is. The Sunday-school, undoubtedly, possesses many evidences of the Divine sanction and blessing; and scarcely any Christian, who has thoroughly examined the system, can doubt at this day that it is a very precious outgrowth of the church, under the hand of a gracious Providence. The church has a great work to perform in the world; and, from age to age, as the necessities of the times have required, she has developed new features and appliances.

It is not yet a century since the present Sunday-school system had its beginning. The good work was not commenced on heathen soil, or where the truth as it is in Jesus was unknown, but where men had been taught to fear God and exercise charity towards mankind. The character of the Sunday-schools, at first, and for some time afterwards, was, it is true, very different from that which they have now attained. To the minds which it first enlisted the idea was new, and they were inexperienced in the work they undertook; books and other supplies, now so abundant, were then altogether

unknown. But that original idea, being a precious seed of Christian benevolence, was destined to expand and rise into a mighty growth. We are aware, indeed, that Raikes' schools were largely employed in imparting the rudimental lessons of a common education; but we cannot forget that the very inception of the plan was the benevolent desire to divert the children from the ways of sin and the profanation of the Lord's name and day. It was the natural result of a Christian impulse and principle. The spark of a holy charity thus brought forth was destined to spread into a great flame. The church at large soon began to recognize the Sunday-school as having been mediately originated by the power of her own love, and light, and life. She saw in the Sunday-school her own child. She pressed it to her bosom as her own precious nursling, and has fostered it to its present growth and advancement towards maturity. By birth and nature, the Sunday-school is, therefore, of the church of Christ.

II. The Sunday-School sustains to the Church the Relation of an Instrumentality.

To the church are Divinely committed vast interests and responsibilities. She is to carry the Gospel to all nations, and leaven with the truth all the communities and families of men. To this end her Lord appointed the holy ministry and the sacraments; but, in imitation of the dear Saviour, she must embrace every offered opportunity, and *seek* for opportunities, to dispense the blessings of the Gospel. One of the most important elements in God's plan, for the conversion of the world, is the application of the truth to the children. The covenant established with faithful Abraham, nearly four thousand years ago, embraced his *children*, and the children of the successive generations of his people. In the Mosaic economy, it was commanded that the children should be most carefully instructed in the history of God's marvellous dealings with their nation, and in the duty of worshipping and obeying him. Malachi, whose prophecy closes the record of the Old Testament, intimates that God would turn the hearts of the fathers to the *children*. Our Saviour, as a child, made inquiry into the truth at the temple. Timothy was com-

mended by Paul for the fact that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation. Parents were divinely enjoined to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Entire households, doubtless embracing children, were received to the privilege, of the church, in the administration of baptism by apostolic hands. The early Christian church understood her great commission, to disciple with the Gospel, as including the children; for it is known that is was not only her practice to baptize the children, but also to instruct them as catechumens for the spiritual service of Almighty God. When the corruptions, which had grown into a vast system of iniquity during a thousand years, were in mercy arrested by the Head of the church, through the Reformation in the sixteenth century, the Holy Spirit moved Luther's heart to establish catechisation for the Christian instruction of the young. Then, again, in later times, when the talent and energy of the church was to be still more developed and employed, in a new and extended illustration of the universal priesthood of believers, God raised up the Sunday-school. The church has already largely employed this instrumentality as a very efficient means of bringing her heart, throbbing with heavenly life and love, more closely and generally to beat against the hearts that need to be nursed into spiritual life. And the church has herself learned more fully to appreciate what Luther saw when he wrote: "The whole power of the Christian church lieth in the young; and if they are neglected, it will become like a garden that is neglected in the spring season."

Although many Snnday-schools are still not in direct organic connection with the church, through individual congregations, it is nevertheless undeniably true that it is through the influence and efforts going forth from the church that they are organized, sustained and instructed. In them are taught the truths of Christianity; they are generally regarded as the schools of particular congregations; they are mostly held in sanctuary edifices; and they are chiefly taught by persons who are members of the Christian church, and by

others whose minds are tacitly committed in favor of the doctrines and hopes of our holy religion. In the case of mission schools, or schools locally removed from our places of public worship, they are the fruit of the church's life and zeal. The children of the church are gathered together; and the children of those without, for whom it is the church's duty to care, are sought out and welcomed. The Sunday-school is doing a work for the church, under the sanction of the church. It takes the minds and hearts of the young, to instruct and impress them by divine truth, thus aiding in fitting them for a worthy profession of faith in Christ, and for a holy and zealous Christian life.

The Holy Bible, which the Lord has entrusted to the Church as her infallible directory in knowledge and duty, is the source from which the lessons of the Sunday-school are professedly drawn. The day upon which these lessons are given, as the name of the school itself imports, is the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath—whence the term Sabbath-school is frequently used. A new and very extensive Christian literature, adapted to the minds of the young, has been produced, as a result of the want and stimulating force of this instrumentality. Never have children read and grown in Christian knowledge to the same extent as in this age. Moreover, this literature is carried home into the houses of the people, and acts powerfully as a popular religious educator and edifier for the church. It is also better adapted to the capacity of a large proportion of the people than much that has been directly prepared for the adult mind.

It is, furthermore, well worthy of notice that the Sunday-school furnishes an important field in which the laity of the church may extensively labor for their Lord. It is a remarkable fact that Robert Raikes, the acknowledged founder of our Sunday-school system, was himself a layman; and that the department of a Sunday-school, now everywhere known as the Infant-school, first enjoyed the instruction of that devoted and self-denying Christian woman, Louise Schepler, although under the directory of the excellent Lutheran Pastor Oberlin, It seems as though the Lord had thus indicated

to the world, by the finger of his providence, that the Sunday-school should present a new sphere in which to call forth the Christian activity and usefulness of the *people* of his church. By hardly any other means besides the modern Sunday-school has God so effectually beaten to the dust, and buried out of sight, the old monastic idea that Christians could best serve their Master in the retirement and idleness of the cloister. And scarcely less effective has the Sunday-school system proved itself in reference to that other mischievous notion, that the minister should perform all the spiritual labor of the congregation. *Prayer* and *Work* have been appointed by the Lord to complement each other in the blessed economy of the Gospel.

Therefore, in whatever aspect we view this subject, we are conducted to the conclusion that the Sunday-school is a very prominent and important instrumentality of the church. At this conclusion we must arrive, not only when we consider the history of the Sunday-school's origin and development, but likewise when we view the system in its aptitude and effectiveness in hastening the triumphs of the Gospel. Where should we begin to sum up the blessings and advantages which the Christian church enjoys at this day as the fruit, more or less directly, of the Sunday-school? Whence does the church in our times most largely draw her candidates for full communion? Does the church now demand an extensive acquaintance with religious knowledge, so that her members may be able intelligently to give a reason of the hope that is in them, and be prepared for Christian duty, and to meet and resist the increasing assaults and temptations of the enemies of God and his truth? The Sunday-school is an efficient means in helping to impart that knowledge. Does the church need a host of faithful, benevolent, self-denying, godly men and women within her fold, who shall worthily exemplify her doctrines and spirit by a holy life, and who shall render valuable aid in the pursuit of every Christian activity for the welfare of our brethren of mankind at large? Then who can tell how much the Sunday-school is contributing to that blessed end? Does the church need to have her own

baptized children specially instructed, through a succession of years, in elements of religion? How eminently has this work been done, or advanced, in the Sunday-school. Does the church—do the pastors of the church—need assistance, general and constant, to bring in the children of unchristian families? What better method of co-operation than the Sunday school could be devised? Does the church largely love and practice the Christian introduction and nurturing of the young by the pastor, with catechism in hand? Then must she not also love and cherish the Sunday-school, which is so effectually preparatory and supplementary to the minister's labors? In this instrumentality the church and ministry are furnished with arms to reach out everywhere, and eyes to be vigilant everywhere, for the salvation of those who are neglected and are without. The Sunday-school aids greatly in building up the church, and in promoting her strength and glory. It adds remarkably to the success of gaining numbers to the ranks of those who shall minister at the church's altar, both at home and in heathen lands. A computation is reported, that at least four-fifths of the ministers in our country were once in the Sunday-school; and that nineteen-twentieths of the missionaries now laboring in foreign fields, enjoyed its advantages. Doubtless, without the Sunday-school, a large proportion of these pastors and missionaries would never even have been brought under the saving power of the Gospel. Well may we exclaim, "What hath God wrought" through the instrumentality of his holy church upon the earth!

It will now very readily be understood that a relation of so exalted a character and far-reaching an influence must involve responsible duties. The church, like a good workman, should learn well the nature and uses of the instrument she is wielding. That instrument, which she has from time to time been fashioning and modifying to answer her purpose, requires, undoubtedly, still further adaptation and improvement. Probabably none of us believe that the Sunday-school has yet attained to the perfection and usefulness to which it is capable of being advanced. Nor do we by any means believe

that everything which has thus far been done in the way of shaping the Sunday-school has really had the effect to improve the system or to enhance its value. Our ideal of the Sunday-school of future times will not be realized from a host of trivial inventions and appliances, but from a purer spirituality and a deeper sense of personal responsibility in the church. Let, then, the nature of the Sunday-school be well studied. Let the sacred relation which it sustains to the church of Christ be well understood, and a corresponding activity be excited. To this end, some kindred observations of a practical bearing may naturally follow:

1. The Sunday-school, evidently very dear to the great Head of the church, should be made a subject of more constant and ardent prayer by the church, on the part of her individual membership, around the family altar, and in her congregated capacity. Being one of her most prominent and effective instrumentalities in this age, especial thought should be taken to draw down upon it the constant and abundant benediction of Heaven. The machinery may be well adapted to its purpose, and may be well-employed; yet there must be a Divine force operating upon it: like Ezekiel's wheel within a wheel, it must ever be moved by a living spirit, even by the Spirit of God. All human instrumentality must fail without the life-giving power from above. It must ever be as it was in apostolic days, even when the most gifted instruments were employed: Paul planted, and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase.

2. Care should be taken that this blessed instrumentality of the church shall not detract from her operations in any other sphere of duty. It should not influence parents to be any less faithful in their solemn duties towards their dear children. The family is one of those two divine institutions that have come down to us with their blessings from the garden of Eden. It is the earliest nursery for the church and heaven. God has bound a solemn obligation upon the soul of every father and mother, which he has confirmed and guarded by the tender bond of affection extending from the heart of parent to child. All conscientious parents will glad-

ly avail themselves of all the helps which they can command, in the work of training their precious household charge for a pious life and a blessed death; but never should they be tempted to forget what is so strictly required at their own hands. Nor will the faithful pastor be induced to think that his responsibility and labor may now be regarded as curtailed, but rather that they are extended. He will not seek to set aside or slur over his work of catechisation in preparing for confirmation. Moreover, the pastor of the congregation, being, by virtue of that relation, the pastor of the school therewith connected, will regard the school as an additional and important point of contact between himself and the children and youth of his parish. It puts into his hands a precious means of largely influencing and directing the character and quality of their religious instruction, and of leading them to repentance and a saving faith in Christ. He will also be rejoiced to interest the young of his flock in holding up his hands by their simple and earnest prayers.

3. Those employed in the work of superintending and teaching Sunday-schools, should seek to gain a suitable impression concerning the true nature and bearing of their work, and the whole congregation should strive to enter into lively sympathy with them. No school can truly flourish without efficient arrangement and government, and without regular and prompt attendance throughout. No superintendent can govern well without the support and co-operation of the teachers. No teacher can be very successful, as an instructor and spiritual guide, without regular and continuous preparation. If this remark be true concerning the pastor, it is usually even more applicable to the Sunday-school teacher. Nor can any teacher rightly prepare, or effectually pray, with reference to his work, unless he bring his mind to dwell much on the greatness and importance of his duty. To sit down and teach a class of little children may seem a very small employment, in the estimation of those who are trying to attract the eye of the world, and are seeking for honor and applause. But the true teacher will not so regard it. His is a work that

touches the sympathies of angels, and moves the heart of Jesus. The employment may be apparently humble, and attract but little notice. The Sunday-school workers may labor on noiselessly, like those who, without the sound of a hammer, laid up the walls and adjusted the timbers in Solomon's temple; yet, like theirs, the result will be glorious. Like the coral insect contributing to the founding of islands in the depths of the sea, the patient, prayerful Sunday-school laborer is quietly working at the permanent foundations of civil society and God's church. He or she is a co-worker with Christ; and, if faithful, the reward in Heaven will be unspeakable.

4. Christians should more generally feel their personal duty to the Sunday-school. It is undoubtedly too much the case that this part of the church's care and labor are left to the younger members of the church and of the community generally. Much praise is due to the young who take so great an interest in this work, but there is labor for many more. The Sunday-school needs more of the influence and wisdom of her most intelligent and spiritual members and of those well advanced in years. Thus would more character and thoroughness be added to the work. Improvement would contribute much toward securing the continued attendance of the elder scholars. The state of our popular education is constantly increasing the importance of intelligence, as well as matured Christian character and experience, in the teacher. Many happy examples of learned, honored and aged Christians laboring in the Sunday-school might be readily cited, and the good result of their influence and work might be recorded, but the praise of such is now in all the churches. So largely has the Lord taught his church to employ the Sunday-school, at this day and in our land, as well as in various other lands, that it may well be a question for all Christians, wherever this sphere of pious labor has extended, whether they are not called by the Master to give it their service. The question being prayerfully weighed, in view of fitness for the work, providential circumstances, and other proper consider-

ations, let each one, for himself or herself, answer the Lord with a conscientious feeling of Christian responsibility.

5. There should be a growing sense of obligation on the part of the church council toward the Sunday-school. In our Lutheran form for the installation of church officers, it is stated, as among the duties of the Elders, that "they shall visit the schools of the congregation from time to time, and see that good order is observed in them, and that the children are properly instructed." None would pretend to say that these are any less to be regarded as duties toward Sunday-schools than any others. It might be difficult to prescribe by general rule, how closely in every case the Sunday-school should be in strict organic connection with the congregation. Perhaps it is best that considerable of the voluntary spirit and of freedom should continue to characterize the school organization. Too many metes and bounds might tend to cramp its energies and suppress its vigorous life. Yet it is to be hoped that the day is not distant when the schools belonging to the congregations shall become so far, at least, a subject of the general care and legislation of our congregations and vestries as to present the appearance of unity, and to secure a controlling power which may be exercised whenever deemed needful. It is well that mission schools, whenever practicable, be connected with congregations, even if they be not so located, geographically and otherwise, as to favor their being the nuclei of future congregations. The school being an educator for Christ's church, it is but right and proper that it have a direct ecclesiastical connection. Thus will the appropriate influence and oversight be more surely and directly guaranteed, both from the congregation and the pastor, even as in the case of the Christian family. As the children should ever be under the church's care, so should it likewise be with the children's Sunday-school.

6. Congregations should be deeply interested in engaging their members in the Sunday-school work. All may not be qualified by natural talent or education for this sphere of Christian activity, and others may be restrained by domestic duties and a variety of circumstances. But there is room for

many more to labor. Comparatively few schools are overstocked with teachers. Almost any school could be enlarged if more persons were at hand to give instruction and to search for scholars. Besides, almost numberless congregations could yet, with an increased number of teachers, establish mission schools around them—in many cases a complete circle of them—like fortifications or recruiting stations. Wherever Christians are actively employed in this manner, the result must be happy, both directly and indirectly. There will be an effect visible in the line of effort, and there will be a reflex influence. "He that watereth shall be watered also himself." The children will be extensively trained for Christ's church on earth and in heaven. The teachers will themselves be very effectually taught in Christian knowledge and duty. They will learn much in the sphere of Christian zeal, charity and self-denial. The whole congregation must feel the enlivening and stimulating effect. The pastor will be encouraged and nerved up for more successful application to his work, and the kingdom of righteousness will develop in power and purity.

7. It is hoped that the day is at hand when congregations will more generally make adequate provision, in the shape of suitable apartments, libraries and other requisites, for their Sunday-schools. Whether the means for carrying on the schools be furnished by direct contributions from the people, or through the agency of the church council, it ought to be promptly and cheerfully provided. Even the most costly schools are, comparatively speaking, very cheaply conducted, and repay the church, even pecuniarily, a hundred-fold. The church should also interest itself in seeing that proper apartments be provided for the Sunday-schools. These should be considered just as much a matter of concern as that the congregation should enjoy a suitable house of worship. What is appropriate in any given case, will depend largely upon the locality and the ability of the congregation, as well as the size and character of the school. In every instance the school should be rescued from straitened and inconvenient rooms, from damp, gloomy, ill-ventilated, uninviting and unhealthy

apartments. Dr. Tyng speaks of the first stage of the Sunday-school, when the sessions were held in the galleries or pews of the churches; and of the second stage—then considered a great advance—which was to dig out a better *cellar* for the church, and pack our children there. He continues, "Here we fought with damp, and cold, and fetid atmosphere, till our universal experience convinced us that though the Gospel might flourish in involuntary dungeons and catacombs, a *chosen* cellar for it was no adequate or appropriate place." We hope now that we shall soon generally see another step taken; when congregations shall provide suitable apartments, specially adapted, in plan and furniture, to the wants of their schools. We would not plead for divans, and fountains, and such-like fanciful and expensive *et cætera*, but only for provisions that are seemly and appropriate.

8. In view of the relation of the Sunday-school to the Church, we should hope for a continued advance in the good and orderly government, and in the appliances and instructions of the school. More solicitude should be shown, that only pure doctrine be taught; more care might, therefore, be used with advantage in the selection of text-books and volumes for the library; for the church must not be indifferent to what is taught, or not taught, to those little ones whom it is her duty to train for the Lord's courts on earth and in heaven. The memory of the scholar should be stored; and fewer novel and trivial expedients for catching the attention should be indulged in. Seeing that the school is so closely related to the church, the scholars ought to be carefully taught in their duty to become fully connected with the church, and in the solemn obligations resting upon church members. They should be taught that the school is not to be substituted for the great congregation of worshippers, and they should be encouraged to attend, as often as possible, the services of the sanctuary. All must see much force in the observation of Mr. Packard, long associated with the American Sunday-School Union, in recommending that the services of the school be made to relate to those of the congregation. He wrote, "The more devices are multiplied, which cannot

be employed in the church, the more unlike the hymns and music and devotions of the school are to the hymns, music, and devotions of the church,—in a word, the more the school differs from the church in its matter and methods of teaching, and in the habits and associations of the pupils, the less likely they are to become members of Christian congregations in after life. Hence we are disposed to wish that those who address schools would avoid, as far as possible, such modes of expression and gesture as would be indecorous in the public teachings of religion." From these sentences a hint may be taken by all who are engaged either in overseeing or teaching in these schools of the church.

9. The relation of the Sunday-school to the church has, happily, yielded much precious fruit, in cultivating Christian love and unity; and in this line the results will yet more largely tend to hasten the fulfilment of the Saviour's prayer, "That they all may be one in us." Through the Sunday-school work have Christians of the same congregation been brought to mingle and to deliberate together far more extensively and intimately than would otherwise have been the case. This result has long ago overleaped congregational lines, yea, and denominational bounds. This one Christian interest is every day accomplishing as much, perhaps, as any other, in bringing about the cultivation of charity, the dissipating of prejudice, the healing of dissensions, and the promotion of a far more extensive union in co-operation and prayer for God's glory in the salvation of men. These results are daily multiplying and strengthening the proofs of the Sunday-school's happy adaptation to this age of Christian development, and of its legitimate and intimate relation to the one Church of our common Lord. In regard to the Sunday-school itself, a more and more extended welcome is given to it among the various Christian nations. It is every year becoming more generally accepted and adopted. There can scarcely be a reason why we should not expect it to bring forth all its special and incidental results, in other lands, as well as in ours.

10. In view of the relation of the Sunday-school to the

church, it should be our hope and prayer, that all those who give instruction in the school, will keep the thought prominently before the minds of their pupils, as well as their own minds, that the Sunday-school is not the end to be aimed at on the part of the scholar, nor on the part of the teacher *for* the scholar. Then will each teacher pray and labor more earnestly for the early conversion and piety of every scholar in his or her class. Then may it be expected that fewer of those who are taught and trained in this Christian nursery will ere long wander away from the school, never to enter into holy covenant with the Lord, their Maker and Redeemer, in the fold of his church. Then may we see the gates of Zion crowded with devout, youthful worshippers: and then shall we be far more decidedly reminded of the fulfilment of that prophetic intimation, when the children were heard singing in the temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David."

May these observations, in reference to a prominent Christian instrumentality, tend to an inquiry that shall result in a better understanding of its nature, and excite to a more intelligent use of its appliances, to the edification of the church! May God add his blessing! And unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus—the Head over all things to the church—throughout all ages, world without end! Amen.

ARTICLE VIII.

PROF. DR. J. T. BECK, OF TUBINGEN, AND HIS VIEWS OF THE WORD OF GOD.

By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Pittsburg, Pa.

The University of Tübingen, established in 1477, is intimately connected with the history of the Reformation, and with the various theological conflicts which have taken place

in the Protestant Church. Reuchlin, the celebrated scholar, who did so much for the revival of the study of the classics, lectured in the University soon after it was founded. Here his nephew, the still more celebrated Melanchthon, studied, and under influences more liberal than those generally prevalent at that time in the universities, he laid the foundation of that scholarship which made him the "teacher of Germany." The attention paid to the Humanities in this school of the prophets aided materially in preparing the way for the Reformation; and during the Reformation this University took an active part in spreading and defending the evangelical doctrines. In the post-reformation period, Andrea, one of its professors, exerted an influence that was felt throughout the evangelical church. He was the principal author of the Formula of Concord. The University itself was under the influence of the theology of this Formula, from the latter part of the sixteenth, and throughout the seventeenth century. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the influence of Bengel, which was felt in England as well as Germany, was specially powerful in Tübingen, and led to a higher appreciation and deeper study of the word of God. Here, too, in the last century, the older Tübingen school of theology, as it is called, had its origin, its founder being G. C. Storr, Professor of Theology in the University. This school, which contended so earnestly for the supernatural element in Christianity, must not be confounded with the modern school of that name, which denies this supernatural element, and regards the Gospel as purely a human product. In striking contrast with the views of Christ and his word, which had prevailed at this University, were those of David Strauss, Repetent in Tübingen, and unknown to fame till in 1835, when he published his "Life of Jesus." Thus this university, which was once the seat of orthodoxy, and a bulwark against infidelity, gave birth to the most influential sceptical work of the age, which attracted the attention of all theologians, and became the occasion of a long critical controversy on the historical character of the Gospels. But Strauss was not alone in his scepticism. Here, too, Bauer was Professor of Theology, the founder of the

modern Tübingen school, whose negative criticism is the culmination of Rationalism and Pantheism. This school applies to theology the most destructive elements of the Hegelian philosophy; or, rather, this school applies to biblical criticism what it regards as the true Hegelian system, while other disciples of Hegel deny that these destructive criticisms are legitimate deductions from his system. But those who judge the theology, taught at Tübingen to-day, by that which prevailed there forty years ago, are greatly mistaken. Instead of Strauss and Baur, we now find at Tübingen professors who rank among the most evangelical theologians of Germany, as Palmer, well-known through his homiletical and liturgical contributions to theological literature; Oehler, Professor of Hebrew Exegesis; Landerer, Professor of Church History, and J. T. Beck, Professor of Dogmatics and Ethics.* The last mentioned is one of Germany's foremost defenders of the Gospel against Rationalism, Pantheism, Romanism, and Formalism. In this country he is not as well known as he deserves. His style is peculiar, his sentences often long and complicated, thus presenting special difficulties to all not perfectly familiar with the German. Besides this, his principal work remains unfinished, so that a complete view of his system cannot yet be given. But in spite of these drawbacks, there are few theologians, the study of whose works will so richly reward the searcher for the deep things of God.

For nearly ten years Beck was a pastor, an office which he highly esteemed and whose duties he performed with pleas-

---

* Persons not acquainted with the changes that have taken place in German universities within the last forty years, are apt to imagine that but few evangelical professors can be found. Let such look at the professors at Tübingen, and at those in other universities, still living or only recently deceased. Thus at Halle we find Tholuck, Julius Müller, Jacobi, Guerike; at Berlin, Nitzsch, Twesten, Dorner, Hengstenberg, Steinmeyer; at Göttingen, Ehrenfeuchter, Schöberlein, Wiesinger, Gess: besides these, men like Kurtz, Delitzsch, Hoffman, Hagenbach, Lange, Ebrard, and a host of others, too numerous to mention, all using their influence for evangelical Christianity.

ure, though under circumstances of peculiar difficulty. In the fall of 1836, he became Professor of theology in Basle, where he remained till the spring of 1843, when he entered on his duties as Professor and university preacher in Tübingen, which position he still occupies.

Beck attracts students from all parts of Germany, and also from other countries, and generally the room in which he lectures, the largest in the university, is crowded. His most celebrated lectures are on ethics; this course requires a winter and summer session, a lecture being delivered daily. Like most of the German professors, he is a close reader, the students writing out the lecture as he delivers it, which, in the beginning, is a most difficult task. But often he leaves his manuscript, and gives extemporaneous explanations and illustrations of his subject. At such times he is full of life, and often rises into real eloquence. He frequently attacks, in his lectures, the negative criticism of the age, clearly stating its results and tendencies, and then brings to bear upon it all his acumen and learning, and, at times, wit and irony. He places the simple, but deep truths of the Gospel, in contrast with the dreary scepticism of the age, by which the former loses none of its attractions. Often, especially during the prevalence of Rationalism, systematic divinity was treated in lectures so dry and dead as to rob the study of all interest. Empty logic and mere abstractions were the husks often given the students, instead of real food for the heart and mind. As far as the Evangelical men are concerned, the style of the lectures is now, generally, very different from this. To them Christianity is not merely a system for the head, but it is also life for the soul. Beck has heart and spirit, as well as intellect, in his lectures, and in listening to him one feels that to him godliness is a living power. Indeed, often it is difficult to tell whether to admire most the depth of his thoughts, or his heartiness. How well he appreciates vital piety, is evident from his inaugural address, delivered when he entered upon his duties as Professor at Tübingen.* "No

* "Ueber das Verhaeltniss des Christenthums zum Zeitleben."

theory and no practice treats men so nobly and so tenderly as biblical Christianity, or seeks, so lovingly, the roots and possibilities of his divine dignity, and respects it even in the lowest; and yet no other system is so misunderstood as biblical Christianity. I acknowledge that it has won my heart and my life, and I know how much I am indebted to it in every respect." And those who know Beck also know that he has been true to the conviction then expressed, and that in his life, and sermons, and lectures, and books, among believers and in the presence of sceptics, he has given proof that he was won and controlled by the Gospel.

In his inaugural address at Basle* he places himself in direct opposition to the views of the prevalent philosophy, on the relation of religion to science. It was delivered at a time when a philosophy was rapidly spreading in Germany, which claimed to be the absolute science, and which treated religion as if entirely at its disposal. In France A. Compte had already begun the publication of his Positive Philosophy. While these vigorous attacks were made against faith, Beck, still a young man, at Basle, on the borders of Germany and France, undertook to vindicate the just claims of religion against thr arrogant claims of sceptical science. Science is not finished, he says. Every age it throws off much that is worthless, whilst it hands down to posterity but little that can be regarded as a valuable possession. Science has by no means attained what it seeks, but it aspires to be perfect, and this imperfection science should never forget. On the other hand Christianity has not, like science, an ideal still to be realized in the future, but it already has perfection in itself. "Again and again, after the boldest and most potent changes, humanity returns to the simple primitive form of Christianity, as its only resting place; in fact, it is from this primitive form that humanity again and again draws strength for new and higher flights." In contrast with the fluid, changeable character of science, Christianity is positive, and its mission is

---

* "Ueber die wissenschaftliche Behandlung der christlichen Lehre. Eine akademische Antrittsrede, gehalten zu Basel den 7. November 1836."

gradually, according to established laws, to leaven humanity with its perfection. Is is, therefore, unreasonable to make religion conform to the continually changing views of philosophy. Nevertheless, so intimately related are they, that science and religion must influence each other. Science has its proper sphere, but it departs therefrom whenever it attempts to control the domain of faith. In this domain faith is as supreme as science in its sphere; for in invisible things nothing is left us but faith, and he who rejects faith knows nothing about them.

Soon after going to Basle, Beck commenced the publication of his system of Christian doctrine, which is still incomplete. In 1837 he published the Introduction to this system.* The first part of the work itself appeared in 1841. Beck's aim may be inferred from the title, "The science of Christian doctrine according to the sacred Scriptures."† In using these, and other books of Beck, our principal aim is to form an idea of his views of the Scriptures, which views determine the entire character of his system.‡

In an age when scepticism is so prevalent among educated men in Germany, and when many regard the Bible as an antiquated volume, it is refreshing to find a profound thinker, like Beck, placing himself unreservedly on the word of God, and drawing from it his life and inspiration. No man bases his system more exclusively on the Scriptures. From all human teaching, and from all human statements of Scriptural truth, Beck wants to lead men back to the word of God as the fountain of all spiritual truth. In human statements imperfections are apt to be mingled with the divine truth; but in God's

---

* "Einleitung in das System der Christlichen Lehre oder propaedeutische Entwicklung der Christlichen Lehr-Wissenschaft." A volume of 300 pages.

† "Die Christliche Lehr-Wissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden. Erster Theil. Die Logik der Christlichen Lehre."

‡ The other books used are: "Leitfaden der Christlichen Glaubenslehre für Kirche, Schule und Haus." 2 vols., 1862. "Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre." Second edition, 1862. And four volumes of sermons, entitled "Christliche Reden."

word we have God's own method of instruction. In our age, Beck thinks, the tendency is to depart from this method and try to improve it with human formulas and logic. The aim of the theologian should be to discover the divine method of teaching, and follow it. Beck values the method, the freshness, the power, and life, and spirit of the Scriptures too highly to let anything else take their place. He thinks the great need of the age is a deep and thorough study of God's word, the sinking of the spirit into its truths so as to be molded and enriched thereby. Instead of the hollow masks and caricatures of Christianity, it becomes us "to present more, and more purely and perfectly, the positive form of Christianity as contained in Scripture; for the word of God will not only speak best for itself, but it will also produce life which shall not lose its breath and power, with whatever critical darts it may be assailed."

One must not imagine that this word needs his genius, or that it must conform to his views. It is not to receive from him, but he is to receive from this word. Many act as if the holy Scripture was a dead letter which is to receive its spirit from the interpreter, whereas the word of God is the product of a Spirit which is life itself, which, accordingly, does not produce a book of dead letters, but a volume in which He himself lives, and to which He is constantly present with His quickening energy, which also communicates itself to the spirits of men." The idea that God's word is not merely the product of the Spirit, but that it also contains spiritual life, and is permeated by the spirit of God, pervades all the writings of Beck. "It is not a theory to be laid aside in practice, but it is the truth, which he ever keeps before him. Though this idea is found throughout the Scriptures, it is most clearly expressed by Jesus, when He says: "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

As all revealed truth is living, the entire revelation forms a living system, an organism. "Revelation stands before us as a living organism with members (ein gegliederter Organismus), which embraces within itself the laws of nature and reason, the law and the prophets, as living systems; all how-

ever, are united and completed in the Christian revelation as the perfect life-system of truth (in der christlichen Offenbarung als dem volkommennen Lebenssystem der Wahrheit). Accordingly, Christianity does not compose itself piecemeal out of the law and the prophets, the truths of nature and of reason, but these are are only intimations, prophecies, preparations for the Christian revelation in which they themselves first attain their complete development into a perfect life-realm of the truth." The truth of the Christian revelation perpetuates itself in reason and in history, but it is not made truth by these, just as little as by its unfoldings of life, nature is made a living nature. "Thus the Christian revelation,owing to its origin in the divine creative causality, already exists as an independent life-system in the word of truth; and owing to the Spirit of truth, which is the creative power in this word, the revelation propagates its testimony of the truth throughout the historical development (insofar as the revelation finds entrance into this development), permeates it more and more, and stamps its original truth-life (Wahrheitsleben) more and more upon the world. Thus revelation, as the archetype of truth, is from God, and is a divine and independent life." "Christianity, therefore, lives already, exists as developed truth, and with its Spirit-word, works as edifying truth, calling, electing, transforming; he who wants to share it, whether scientifically or otherwise, must, first of all, have been apprehended by the edifying life-power of Christianity, and in his innermost soul must be wedded to it, that is, he must have faith."

As the Spirit of God produces a word which contains a life like his own, and as the Spirit of God is always in this word, it follows that he who receives this word also receives this Spirit and spiritual life. Beck likes to call the word of God a "Spirit-Word" (Geistes-Wort). Its spiritual life is quickening in its effect. "The biblical method calls its work a sowing and planting, generating and bringing forth, striking root and bearing fruit; whilst its means of instruction are called living word, spirit, power, seed; it is, in one word, a process to beget life, it is the generative method." Thus all that is

connected with divine revelation is living and life-giving; its method, its means, its products, are living. The human heart is the soil in which the living spiritual seed is sown; from this, if the soil is good, springs a spiritual life like the seed. Thus the word of God is from the Source of all spiritual life, is spiritual life, and produces spiritual life.

Such being the character of God's word, its relation to all systems of Christian doctrine is that of the fountain to the stream. It cannot be the aim of the Christian theologian to evolve the truth out of his mind, as the speculative philosopher tries to do; nor can it be his aim to take certain biblical truths as mere occasions for independent discoveries of new spiritual knowledge, as is the case with theosophy; he must receive in faith the truth of God's word, and on that he is entirely dependent for his spiritual knowledge. Just as we cannot create nature, so we cannot create the realm of spiritual truth. We cannot draw it from our minds, as if deposited there; it is a kingdom that exists outside of us, and which must reveal itself to us; after the revelation is made we can take from it living and quickening elements. The mistake of many is that they suppose that the mind contains the truth apriori, and presents it to our consciousness without any influence from things external to us; just as if the mind were not merely the means of understanding the truth, but also the source of the truth, so that out of itself the mind can evolve the truth. This supposition is as productive of error in theology, as it is in natural science, to suppose that nature, with all its contents and forms, is the product of our speculative thinking.* But whilst we cannot produce spiritual truth, it can reproduce itself in us. It is life, and as such, it can only communicate itself to us by means of regeneration. In the new birth this spiritual life is born in us.

As spiritual truth is life, it is self-evident that it cannot be appropriated by a mere effort of the understanding. It is a life that cannot be demonstrated into a man, but that must be possessed. And he who has within him this spiritual life

---

* These views are given in the beginning of the "Einleitung."

has in it the most convincing evidence of the truth of God's word. In spiritual hearts the logic of scripture is invincible. And Beck has such confidence in God's word that he believes that all who learn to know it will be convinced of its truth and won by it. It needs no external influence to make it powerful. "Without using much scientific, dialectic, or historical apparatus, Beck knows how to place us at once into the very midst of the pulsating life of God's word, and to unfold to us, in such a pithy manner, its wealth and truthfulness that, being overwhelmed with the living impressions and views thus given, we forget, besides these witnesses of the Spirit and of power, to ask for any other evidences of the truth of the divine oracles. He also knows how to present, in their reality and sovereign majesty, the contents of Scripture, the kingdom of God, and the organism of ideas unfolded in it, and to show the vanity of all human power, wisdom and art, in comparison with the glory with which divine truth establishes itself, by its own means, in the hearts of men. But whilst he thus rejects the false pretensions and arts of human thought and practice, he on the other hand, in a rich and living way, connects the divine with the human, the kingdom of grace with the kingdom of nature. Thus we gain a comprehensive organism of truth which unites, in a profound manner, the general truths of conscience and the special truths of revelation, the spheres of creation, redemption, logic, ethics and physics."*

With such a view of Scripture it is natural that Beck should require spirituality in every interpreter of God's word. The Spirit of God in a man, and this alone, enables a man to recognize and understand the teachings of the spirit in the Scriptures. In first Corinthians, second chapter, Scripture gives the best rule for its own interpretation, Spiritual truth must be spiritually discerned. The preacher and theological professor must, therefore, be a man of God, otherwise he lacks the first requisite for his profession. The aim of every religious teacher should be to give his hearers God's word; and everything is valuable in so far as it aids in bringing this

* Auberlen, "Göttliche Offenbarung," vol. 1, p. 374.

home to the heart. Beck has little faith in the arts of rhetoric and oratory in religious instruction. In the pulpit he is very artless. His sermons have no external divisions; they are not produced on the principles of art, but they are a growth. Of religious oratory he says: "Religious oratory does not, like that of Cicero and Demosthenes, aim to produce certain states for a certain time, or for some special purpose; but its aim is to train morally and spiritually, to form character, to make men the children of God; it is not merely to affect the emotions and to give knowledge, but it is to convert a man and edify him in the truth." And while he despises the modern tricks of oratory, which are so often resorted to at the expense of divine truth, the popularity and the influence of his sermons, both in the pulpit and in the printed volume, are a striking proof of the power of the plain but living preaching of the Gospel.

There are many other things in Beck's, works which are worthy of special mention. He deprecates the separation of doctrine from life, and the gulf between dogmatics and ethics, in the teachings of many professors. His view of the term "heart" in Scripture, as the centre of our being, and not merely as the seat of the emotions, as lying back of all our activity, and the source of all our thoughts, and feelings, and volitions, is very suggestive. Being the fountain of life, the change of the heart is the change of the whole man. This view of the heart, in many passages of Scripture, throws new light on them, and opens mines of spiritual truth otherwise hidden.

We expected to give Beck's views of faith and conscience; but our article, we fear, is already too long. We delight to dwell on the principles of our author, which are so much needed by our sceptical and unscriptural age. And it is a source of joy to us, to know that these principles have found an entrance into the hearts of many religious teachers, in Germany and other lands, through whom they are communicated to others, thus preparing the way for a more scriptural and more spiritual Church.

ARTICLE IX.

THE CODEX SINAITICUS.*

Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. Auspiciis augustissimis Imperatoris Alexandri II. ex tenebris protraxit in Europam transtulit ad juvandas atque illustrandas sacras literas edidit Constantius Tischendorff. Petropoli, MDCCCLXII.

By Charles A. Hay, D. D., of Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Through the courteous agency of our highly esteemed fellow-citizen, Hon. A. G. Curtin, Minister of the United States at the court of St. Petersburg, a copy of this splendid work has been presented to the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and we take pleasure in furnishing some account of it to the readers of the Review, assured that they heartily rejoice with us that such a valuable addition has been made to the library of this Institution.

The work is contained in four volumes, imperial quarto, sixteen by seventeen inches, and is printed upon very heavy paper, of the finest quality, almost equalling parchment in tenacity and solidity. The first volume contains the dedicatory address, the prolegomena, a critical commentary upon the text, and twenty-one pages of tinted paper, exhibiting minutely exact photographic fac similes of various portions of this manuscript, together with fragments of other codices of great antiquity. The second and third volumes contain the Septuagint, and the fourth the entire New Testament, together with the Epistle of Barnabas and part of the Shepherd of Hermas.

In the graceful dedicatory address to his "Most August, Powerful and Gracious Lord and Sovereign Alexander II,

Emperor of All the Russias, &c., &c.," the Editor expresses devout gratitude to God, who had permitted him, under the auspices of the Emperor, three years before, to bring forth from its oriental obscurity and to transfer to Europe this treasure of sacred literature, and who had now further enabled him, by crowding the labors of many years within three, to deliver into the hands of the Emperor this same document so accurately reproduced through means of types and lithographic tablets, and further illustrated in various ways. Whilst doing this with profound reverence, he finds exquisite delight in announcing, with absolute confidence, that the excellence of the Codex has been illustriously vindicated by the more searching investigation to which it had been subjected. "Beyond all other documents of the same kind, it possesses indisputable indications of the most ancient nobility. The men of the most remote antiquity, venerable fathers, as well of the Orient as of the Occident, arise as witnesses that the men of their day derived their knowledge of the mysteries of sacred literature from documents precisely resembling this."

"This document, cotemporary with the first Christian Emperors, was safely housed, as in a sacred retreat, at the foot of that mountain upon which the glory of God anciently shone before Moses, and whence the divine law was divinely proclaimed. There it lay hidden for many centuries, that, now shining forth again, it might find its way to THEE, and through THY HANDS go forth into the whole world, holding forth a new light to this generation, as a herald of the ancient truth."

"It proclaims, at the same time, that THY MOST AUGUST HOUSE continues to cherish its ancestral piety, as well as literature and the arts. For, by its very nature, this work is sacred to Christ and to literature. Hence all who are devoted to Christ and to literature, applaud THY munificence. In the name of these, it becomes me, first of all, to bear to THEE the assurance of profoundest gratitude.

"But, in my own name, I render to THEE, MOST AUGUST EMPEROR, the most heartfelt thanks, that THOU hast committed to me so great a work, with so much favor, and with such implicit confidence. I have earnestly striven so to discharge

this trust, that a work may go forth from my hands upon whose front we may inscribe

To Christ and to Literature."

In the first flush of joy at the discovery of the Codex, he expressed the hope that this illustrious witness of divine truth might be presented, in a suitable dress, to the reading public, within three years. This was accomplished, beyond the expectations of all who had any adequate idea of the labor of such an undertaking. Nor would the author have ventured to excite such expectations, if he could have known from the beginning, what labor he would have to undergo. * * * Among other hindrances, it was found, not only that new types would have to be cast, so as more accurately to represent the precise form of the original text, and that there was a very great variety of the large uncial letters, and of the smaller ones used for interlineation, and of those closely joined together; but also, that even by the use of these, the printed edition would still be widely different from the written document, by reason of the spaces, which occurred in various ways, between the single letters. This latter difficulty was obviated by inserting strips of metal between the letters, as the intervals of the written text required. This was a novel method, and extremely troublesome. The spaces had all to be measured by a repeated trial of the different letters, thus computing what number of metal strips each space would require. It thus became necessary to insert more than one hundred thousand of these dividing strips into the body of the text of the New Testament alone. "And there was another matter that added, beyond all expectation, to the labor of preparing this work. For, instead of there being, as I at first supposed, about eight thousand places that had suffered at the hands of correctors, nearly twice that number of such places were discovered. The places that had been, in various ways altered by later hands, (the parchment, too, being often injured by time and use,) greatly weakened the eyes and wearied the mind. Besides, the photographic and lithographic operations, in the preparation of the twenty-one tables, occasioned me far more care than I expected; especially as I did

not receive as much aid from the photographic art as was promised, and a great proportion of the tables had to be prepared at Leipzig."

"Nevertheless, by the kindness of God, we have been enabled to accomplish our most ardent wish, and now this venerable sage of fifteen hundred years, comes forth like a victor adorned with a wreath of laurel, or I should rather say, with a crown of life. He rises from the sepulchre, that he may be a most eloquent witness of the ancient truth to the men of this age, as many as are interested in the word of eternal life. Commissioned and supplied with resources by his most exalted and munificent Imperial Majesty, we have spared neither labor nor expense, that, insofar as the time allowed, such a monument should be erected as would deserve praise both on account of the information and proofs of diligent study it would contain, and on account of its artistic execution; and which would testify to this, and to coming generations, that this edition has been so prepared as to be worthy of the exalted Prince, under whose auspices it appears, and to be of essential advantage to the cause of literature. Since God, with such manifest favor, has committed this treasure of sacred literature to our hands, we could not feel at all satisfied with ourselves unless we published it in as accurate and splendid a form as possible."

Humbly acknowledging his dependence upon divine aid, and honestly confessing great anxiety that the result of his labors may meet the reasonable expectations of the learned, he proceeds to give a detailed account of the circumstances connected with the discovery of the manuscript, its transfer to St. Petersburg, and the labors incident to the preparation of the fac simile. Then follows a description of the Codex, the materials of which it is composed, the arrangement of its parts, the style of the hand-writing, the kinds of ink employed, marks of punctuation, abbreviations, &c.; proofs that several hands assisted in its original preparation; critical judgments as to its age, &c.; of the numerous alterations, additions, &c.; minute explanations of the extreme care that had been taken to represent accurately, not only the original

text, but also the interlineations, erasures, &c., by later hands; proofs of the extreme antiquity of the document; and a carefully considered estimate of its comparative value among the critical materials for restoring the apostolical integrity of the sacred text.

Whilst this entire preface, written in smoothly flowing Latin, and printed in a style that is of itself a feast for the eyes, would, no doubt, greatly interest the readers of the REVIEW. the limits allotted to us forbid our presenting at this time more than a few of its leading points.

Dr. Tischendorff alludes to his researches in the leading libraries of Europe, for several years preceding 1844, in quest of critical materials for restoring the text of the New Testament, and of his yearning desire then to extend his search to the ancient monasteries of the East. This desire was gratified in 1844, under the patronage of Frederick Augustus, of Saxony, and he returned with various fragments of the Greek version of the Old Testament, which were deposited in the library at Leipzig, and shortly afterwards published. These he obtained at the monastery of St. Catharine, on Mt. Sinai, accidentally discovering them in a basket of rubbish. As these were just about being destroyed, they were readily given to him, but other and larger portions of the same Codex, that had also been exhumed with these, containing the whole of Isaiah and the Books of the Maccabees, were refused to him. All attempts to secure these failed; nor, upon a second visit to St. Catherine, in 1853, intent upon collating these fragments for a new edition of the Septuagint, could he even procure a sight of them, or learn what had become of them. So he gave up all hopes.

"But God meant it far otherwise," he adds. Through the intervention of Falkenstein, Minister of Public Instruction in Saxony, and of the Russian Minister at Dresden, with the co-operation of various distinguished parties, and with the recommendation of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, at St. Petersburg, the Emperor Alexander was induced to furnish him with all the needed facilities for an extended and thorough research, in the countries of the East, for documents il-

lustrative of the sacred text. On the 31st of January, 1859, he once more reached the monastery of St. Catharine, and was most kindly welcomed by the Sinaitic monks, the venerable chief himself expressing the wish that he might succeed in discovering new pages of the divine truth. On the fourth of February, when he had already sent one of the servants to procure camels, with which, on the seventh, he purposed to return to Egypt, whilst walking with the steward of the monastery, he spoke about the Septuagint version, several copies of his edition of which he had brought along (together with some copies of his New Testament,) as presents to the fraternity. Returning from their walk they entered the chamber of the steward. There, he said, he too had a copy of the Septuagint, and produced it, "wrapped in a cloth. I uncovered it and beheld what surpassed all my hopes. For there were the most abundant remains of the Codex which I had previously declared to be the most ancient of all existing Greek manuscripts, among which I found not only the portions which I had drawn forth from the basket, in 1844, and other books of the Old Testament, but also, what was of far greater moment, the entire New Testament, without the least omission, and besides, the whole Epistle of Barnabas, and the first part of the Shepherd. I could not conceal my delight. With the consent of the steward I took to my chamber portions of the manuscript. He had brought it from the cell of the monk whose duty it was to act as custodian of the sacred vessels. This cell contains the books, written and printed, for the most part of a liturgical character, and the liturgical parapharnalia, and there, shortly after my first oriental journey, the rest of these fragments had been deposited. Once in my chamber, I soon fully understood what a treasure I held in my hands, and I poured forth my praise and gratitude to God, who had conferred so great a blessing on the Church, upon the cause of literature, and upon myself. I spent that first night in transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas, for sleep was out of the question. On the following day the monks agreed that, if the ecclesiastical authorities at Cairo would allow it, they would send the codex

to me, at Cairo, to be transcribed. Departing, therefore, upon the day previously appointed, officially recommended by the librarian, Cyril, a learned monk, I arrived at Cairo on the thirteenth of February, and received the documents from the hands of the authorities on the twenty-fourth day of the same month, the messenger having crossed and recrossed the Egyptian and Arabian desert within nine days." Within two months, by the aid of two assistants, a physician and a druggist, the transcription of the codex was completed.

Emboldened by the kindness of the ecclesiastical authorities, he ventured, thereupon, to request that the original document itself should be presented to His Imperial Majesty, Alexander II. the most distinguished representative of the Greek Church. Nor was he disappointed. On the 28th of September, 1859, the venerable codex was formally delivered to him, at Cairo, as a present for the Emperor.

Returning in November to Petersburg, he laid his precious treasures before the Emperor and Empress, consisting of ancient Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Hebrew, Samaritan, Abyssinian, Armenian and Slavonic manuscripts, with which their Majesties were highly delighted, and which they ordered at once to be exhibited to the public. At the same time his Majesty determined that the most important of them all should, without delay, be given, in a most convenient form, to the Church and the literary public. Dr. T. then resolved to propose that the form in which it was to appear should be, first, as close an imitation as possible of the original writing; secondly, that it should be worthy of the man under whose auspices it was to be executed; and, thirdly, that it should satisfy, as completely as possible, the expectations of those who are devoted to the critical study of the sacred text.

A full account then follows of the care expended upon the preparation of type that should exactly represent the varying forms of the letters, simple and compound, in the manuscript, both in the text itself and in the interlineations and marginal additions that were the work of later hands. Then follows an account of his repeated journeys, back and forth, between Leipzig and Petersburg, and his painstaking to se-

cure the very choicest materials for the execution of the work, &c., &c.

There follows next a description of the Codex, from which we extract the following: "The parchment is somewhat yellowish, remarkably light and thin, though the pages differ considerably in these respects. Throughout the entire Codex, with the exception of a few leaves, the one page of the leaf preserves the writing better than the other. The cause of this lies in the nature of the skin from which the parchment was prepared; for the inner or flesh side of the skin is much softer than the outer. And it is remarkable, that throughout the whole manuscript the softer and harder parts are so joined together that two softer pages always include two harder ones. There is little doubt but that the skins from which this parchment was made, were those of a species of antelope still frequently found in the deserts of Lybia, Egypt and Arabia. In part asses' skins also were used for that purpose. And it is not easy to decide which of these two kinds produced the superior parchment. Such is the size of the Codex, however, that in either case one animal's skin could furnish only one sheet of parchment, *i. e.*, by bending it in the middle it would present surface enough for four pages. The Codex is made up of quaternions, *i. e.*, four skins, each folded once, making eight pages. These are regularly numbered, on every eighth page, and constitute an uninterrupted series throughout the entire volume, the Old and New Testament together constituting one σωματιον; such as were the fifty which the Emperor Constantine ordered to be prepared for the use of the Constantinopolitan Church, as Eusebius records in his life of Constantine, 4 : 36."

The precise dimensions of the original pages are represented in the lithographic tables appended to the first volume, about fourteen by fifteen inches, though there is no doubt but that they have been somewhat reduced in size. For frequently along the edges, either at the top of the page, where formerly the number of the quaternions was marked with red ink, or along the right side, where the notes were usually inserted, the letters have been partly cut off.

In accordance with the usage of early calligraphists, lines were drawn perpendicularly with a style upon the parchment, one upon each side of every column, to limit the length of the lines, and others horizontally, to indicate the limit of the verses. These horizontal lines, however, sometimes include two and even three verses.

The ink used in the most ancient style of writing, was usually dark. It often has an ashy hue, sometimes yellowish, sometimes a reddish brown, and often wears a gloss. This variety of color seems to have depended not only upon the difference in the ink itself, but also upon the quality of the parchment.

The ancient corrections do not differ much from the original writing in the ink that was used. Those which we have designated as coming from the writer A, are, for the most part, a little paler; but this may be partly owing to the fact that the letters are more lightly traced; for where they equal the letters of the text in size, the ink is dark. The notes of the corrector B, have exactly the same color with the text on the softer pages, but are rather more black on the harder side of the parchment. The later correctors, whom we designate C^a and C^b, mostly used reddish brown and yellow ink.

The titles and numbers of the Psalms are written in vermillion; so also the titles in explanation of the Song of Songs, the numbers by which the Ammonian sections and the canons of Eusebius are indicated, and the inscription of the book of Ecclesiastes; and the same is the case in part with the ornaments which are called arabesque, as at the end of the Psalter and of the Gospel of Mark. Whatever was written in vermillion has been so printed in our edition.

The style of punctuation is exceedingly sparing and simple. The text of the books written in verses, which occupy the whole of the third volume, is altogether destitute of interpunction, although the character of the verses is not such as to compensate for the want of punctuation, as is the case with the verses [στιχοι?] of Euthalius, employed in the transcription of St. Paul's Epistles. The existing points have nearly all been added by later hands. Many columns, and even entire pages, present the text without a single point. In some parts of the

text, as in the books of Tobit and Judith, larger and smaller intervals in the text compensate for the want of punctuation marks.

Dr. Tischendorff confesses that he found this feature of the Codex a most perplexing one, and announces, with becoming diffidence, his critical judgment concerning the dates and authors of the various styles of punctuation, here and there introduced by successive correctors.

In describing the various unusual marks that occur occasionally, the abbreviations, combined letters, &c., he mentions also a singular monagram for Christ, or the cross, resembling a letter P, with the perpendicular stroke drawn disproportionately long, and having another line drawn horizontally, just under the curve. This same character appears four times in the Vatican MS. (at the end of Lamentations, Ezekiel, Gospel of John and Acts), twice in the Alexandrian, (end of II Kings and II Esdras) and three times in Codex Sinaiticus. It was used upon coins stamped in the year 335, and it is altogether probable that it was employed by transcribers of the sacred records in the age of Constantine.

In the opinion of the learned editor, this most ancient document was not the work of one transcriber, but of four, although the resemblance between their style of writing is very great, and special attention is needed to distinguish them. The writer whom he designates as A, wrote the first book of Maccabees, a fragment of Chronicles, and the entire New Testament (except seven leaves and the Shepherd); B wrote the Prophets and the Shepherd; C, the books written in the antique style of versification, and D the books of Tobit and Judith, also the first three leaves of the fourth book of Maccabees, with the half leaf, the tenth and fifteenth leaves of the gospel of Matthew, the last leaf of Mark and the first of Luke, the second leaf of the first epistle to the Thessalonians, and the third leaf of the epistle to the Hebrews; perhaps also a part of the first leaf of the Apocalypse. These various and yet strikingly similar styles, are most accurately and satisfactorily exhibited in the lithographic tables appended to the first volume.

The diversity of style in the hand-writing does not, however, in the opinion of Dr. T., indicate diversity of age in the various parts of the manuscript, as there are satisfactory proofs in the document itself, that its different portions were cotemporaneously written.

Among the correctors, the writer D holds the principal place. He revised what the others wrote, especially in the New Testament. Nor did the other three original writers withhold their hands from adding corrections here and there, as the Editor shows in the photographic tables. Abundant illustrations are also given, in accurate photographic fac simile, of the various later emendations, restorations of faded letters, and additions, that were made by subsequent possessors of the manuscript, even as late as the twelfth century. Some of these annotations are in Arabic and some are bilingual, both Arabic and Greek. Among the latest is probably the alteration of OS to THEOS in the celebrated passage in first Timothy.

The learned Editor then proceeds to describe the pains that were taken to give to the printed edition as close a resemblance as possible to the original text, not only in the varying forms of the letters, but as to their precise distance from each other and their position in the line. And so also with the marks of punctuation and abbreviation, the subscriptions and superscriptions, the numbers and notes. His chief aim was to present the text *as originally written.* But he has striven also to represent the emendations of the original correctors. The later corrections are described in the commentary, which corresponds to the text, line for line, as occasion for comment presents itself. In those passages that have been changed by partial erasure and rescription, the original words have been printed, whenever they could be clearly distinguished. Where they were so nearly obliterated as to make the original reading a matter of conjecture, the printed copy exhibits the later writing and the commentary presents the conjectures of the Editor.

No date was appended to the Codex by those who wrote it,

nor is there any tradition concerning its age or history among the monks of St. Catharine. "Before I brought to light those fragments of the Old Testament in 1844, none of the fraternity had for a long time paid any attention to the scattered leaves, or seemed to have any knowledge of them, nor did learned travellers make any record from which one might suppose that they had seen the Codex or heard of it. But it has certainly been for many centuries in the possession of the monastery of St. Catharine. Although Dionysius, Hilarion and Theophylact, who were among the last of those who made the Codex an object of study and a means of perpetuating their own names, and who must have lived about the twelfth century, do not appear to have held the office of arch bishop in those days, yet it may perhaps be shown from the annals of the monastery that they belonged to the fraternity at that time. Those familiar with the history of those ancient times will remember that that noble citadel and refuge of early piety, erected about the year 530, under the protection and at the expense of the Emperor Justinian, was never destroyed. Nor is it incredible, that at the same time provision was made by the munificence of the Emperor, that the monks, for whom he had such high regard, should not lack a supply of sacred books, which would scarcely be procured anywhere else than at Alexandria, the source of the most highly prized manuscripts. But nothing can, in this way, be learned that will definitely fix the age of the Codex." * *

"But there is another method by which an intelligent and candid inquirer may form an opinion of the highest probability. No ancient document in existence exhibits such illustrious proofs of most antique nobility, or rather I should say, of such venerable antiquity. The arguments with which the antiquity of the Codex Vaticanus has been vindicated by Hug and others, including myself, (and this alone can be compared with the Codex Sinaiticus)—these arguments not only apply with equal force to our manuscript, but are enforced and confirmed by others of no small authority." * *

The first proof of antiquity is furnished by the style of the writing, which is more antique in character than any of

the parchment codices with which we are acquainted, even approximating to that of the Herculanean and Egyptian papyrus manuscripts. This feature is explained at length, and beautifully and convincingly illustrated, in the lithograpic tables, which present a great variety of specimens of the oldest existing papyrus and parchment codices.

Another evidence is found in the number of columns written upon each page. The editor refers to the argument so confidently advanced by Hug, in 1810, in commenting upon the antiquity of the Vatican Codex, based upon its having three columns upon a page. This he urged as proof that it was written at an era when the style was changing from scrolls to square manuscripts, the writers endeavoring to keep up the resemblance to the accustomed scroll by spreading as many columns as posssble at once before the eye of the reader. The Vatican volume presents, says Hug, six columns at once to the sight of the beholder. If this be an argument for antiquity, says Tischendorff, the Sinaitic Codex excels, for it offers to view eight columns at once.

The Sinaitic agrees with the Vatican Codex in preserving the more ancient style both of orthography and of grammatical inflection and construction, which differed, in many respects, from the purer Greek. The later transcribers were in the habit of accommodating the text to the common Greek. "Besides, the order in which the books of the New Testament are arranged, viz: the placing of the Acts of the Apostles after the Pauline Epistles, as we find it also in the most ancient Syriac version, this harmonizes with the custom of those times in which the order followed in the rest of the most ancient codices, the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and the Codex Ephremi, had not yet been introduced and fixed. And again, the inscriptions and subscriptions of the separate books of the New Testament are distinguished for antique simplicity, as, *e. g.* πραξεις is used alone, as it occurs everywhere in the writings of the fathers, but nowhere, so far as I know, in any of our existing codices."

The editor does not attach much importance to the numbers indicating the Ammonian sections, and the canons of

Eusebius, as these may have been appended by a later hand. But a more definite indication of age he finds in the fact that all the oldest Greek manuscripts of the Gospels, except the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, are furnished with larger headings to the Gospels, which style was certainly not introduced before the age of Euthalius.

Of great weight he considers the fact that the Codex Sinaiticus exhibits the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd as constituting a part of the sacred canon. For it is well-known that in the second and third centuries, both these books aspired to canonical authority, and were, in fact, by many admitted into the canon, of which fact we have illustrious witnesses in Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen; and also that Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3 : 25) admitted the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd along with the Acts of Paul and the Apocalypse of Peter among the αντιλεγομενα, or the books of doubtful authority; with which agrees also the celebrated index of the canonical books, added about the middle of the sixth century to the Codex Claromontanus, but which was doubtless some centuries older than the codex itself—"the Epistle of Barnabas, the Revelation of John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Shepherd, the Acts of Paul, the Revelation of Peter"—; and it is also universally admitted that about the end of the fourth century, (*i. e.* in the councils of Laodicea, in 364, and of Carthage, 397,) it was publicly taught that neither Barnabas nor the Shepherd was entitled to a place among the canonical books. The coincidence between the Codex Sinaiticus and Eusebius and the Codex Claromontanus, is enhanced by the fact that between Barnabas and the Shepherd six leaves are wanting, upon which it is altogether probable that the third of the antilegomena of Eusebius was written, and the Codex is no longer complete at the end, even the greater part of the Shepherd being wanting.

"Now, when," asks the Editor, "shall we suppose that a biblical Codex of such a description, so carefully and elegantly adorned, was prepared? What books, especially of the New Testament, is it likely that Eusebius would have introduced into the copies that were to be sent to the Emperor?

Either one of two courses he might pursue; either to admit nothing but what was approved by the common consent of all the Churches, or to exclude nothing but what was generally rejected. As the latter was the safer plan, and could readily be done without offending any, since the parts not approved could be left unused, so it would have seemed sacriligious and detestable, arbitrarily to exclude from the canon what many held to be sacred, before any public decision on the subject had been given. In a matter of such importance and so obnoxious to unfriendly criticism, it is supposed that a prudent bishop would so execute the mandate of an Emperor anxious to promote the cause of Christianity, as to gratify the public, and to keep himself as free as possible from blame, though it cannot at all be asserted that he admitted promiscuously all the books, which, in his history of the church, he had described as αντιλεγομενα. If these opinions be correct, it would seem that the Codex Sinaiticus admirably conforms to the standard of Eusebius, those books being appended which are most akin to the more important antilegomena, (viz: the five catholic epistles and the apocalypse), and yet are inferior to them in authority. No other such codex is extant. The Vatican Codex extends only to the ninth chapter of Hebrews. And the Alexandrian, in which two epistles, ascribed to Clement, are incorporated with the canonical books, although it testifies that, in the fifth century, when there is good reason to believe it was written, one or other of the antilegomena, which was still generally used in public, despite the prohibition of councils, was transcribed along with the canonical books, yet, nevertheless, it has nothing in common with the canon of Eusebius or the Claromontane Codex. This feature, however, of the Sinaitic Codex does not necessarily compel us to ascribe it to the fourth century; a document like this might well be reckoned as belonging to the fifth century; but it is altogether more probable that it was executed when this could be done with some sanction of ecclessiastical authority.

An additional argument for the great age of the manuscript is derived from the fact that all of the correctors, ex-

cept the last, who added only a few notes, employed the uncial character. In no other similar codex has this ever been observed. Besides, as previously observed, already in the eighth century, the writing on many of the pages had become so pale that fresh ink was applied to the letters, and this not only once, but a second time, although when the first renovation took place cannot be accurately ascertained.

But, to omit much that might be here adduced, by far the strongest argument for its great antiquity yet remains to be mentioned, and this is furnished by the text of the Codex itself. Among the editor's illustrations of this point we adduce the following. The last chapter in the Gospel of Mark, in almost all the ancient codices contained twenty-one verses. So it appears in our most celebrated Greek manuscripts of the fifth and sixth centuries, the Alexandrian, Ephremi, Cambridge, with the remaining fourteen uncial and all the cursive codices; also in seven of the Itala, together with all of the Vulgate, all the Syriac, the Gothic, and others. Nevertheless Eusebius testifies to Marinus that the last twelve verses were wanting in nearly all the most accurate copies, which testimony is confirmed by Jerome, who writes to Hedebia that nearly all the books of the Greek want this passage. Whilst, therefore, more than five hundred Greek manuscripts, written from the fifth century onward, with wonderful uniformity, exhibit these verses, which Eusebius, before the year 340 (when he died), testifies were not found in most of the manuscripts, the Sinaitic and Vatican stand alone as faithfully representing the custom of the Eusebian age. The Epistle to the Ephesians furnishes a still more striking case of this kind, which is detailed.

Other readings are then presented, which ancient writers mention as existing in manuscripts of their day, but which do not occur in any, or in very few, that are now extant. In Matthew 13 : 35, for instance, the word ησαιου was contained in the text in the third century, according to the testimony of Porphyry, whom Jerome reports as charging Matthew with a blunder for inserting it—"Evangelista vester Matthaeus

tam imperitus fuit ut diceret * * * per Esaiam—." And as Jerome could no longer find this reading in his manuscripts, he concludes that it had been removed or omitted from the text by prudent men—"postea a prudentibus viris sublatum," —although Eusebius, commenting on the seventy-eighth Psalm, and Clement in the Homilies 18 : 15, both testify to the text of Porphyry. Now this reading of the third century has disappeared from all the uncial manuscripts and versions, but not so with the Codex Sinaiticus, in which the text, as originally written, stands δια ησαιου του προφητου; and this reading is found also in the following cursive manuscripts: 1, 13, 33, 124, 253. Similar instances are then furnished from Jn. 7 : 8, Lk. 7 : 35, Jn. 1 : 4, Mr. 11 : 1, &c., &c., in some of which cases the Codex Sinaiticus is confirmed by one or more of the other older uncial manuscripts.

Further, ten instances are detailed in which this Codex stands absolutely alone, among all the Greek manuscripts, uncial or cursive, in confirming the testimony of ancient versions and fathers, as to the readings of the still earlier codices from which those versions and quotations were made.

In concluding this part of his preface the editor remarks: "Let these suffice. They are sufficient to prove the admirable character of this text, that the Codex Sinaiticus more closely resembles the manuscripts used in the earliest days of Christianity than the Vatican and all the rest. And, in weighing all these arguments in proof of its extreme antiquity, it should not be overlooked that they are cumulative in their character, and that nothing can be said against them."

The editor is still not satisfied with this array of remarkable various readings, but proceeds to offer long lists of passages in illustration of the general style of the manuscript, and to vindicate for it a most commanding place among the critical apparatus within our reach for restoring the apostolic integrity of the sacred text.

In answer to the anticipated objection that the text is less valuable because it has been tampered with by correctors, he replies that the original writers, professional Alexandrian calligraphists, knew but little Greek, and copied faithfully,

and even slavishly, what was laid before them, and that the original text, which can in almost every instance be readily recognized, is altogether free from all attempts at critical emendation. Later annotations can pass for what they are worth.

For the further characterization of the text he arranges the various readings of special interest in three classes: *first*, those which demonstrate the remarkable similarity between the Sinaitic manuscript and the Vatican, &c.; *secondly*, those in which, whilst differing from all these, it exhibits the readings approved by the most important fathers and versions; *thirdly*, those in which it alone, of all extant witnesses, preserves the true reading.

We regret that our limits forbid the citation of the profuse illustrations here presented by the editor. Perhaps we may have a future opportunity of exhibiting some of them to the readers of the REVIEW.

In concluding, Dr. T. remarks: "After these statements it will be scarcely necessary for me to add what place I think should be assigned to this Codex among our most celebrated manuscripts. It seems worthy to be regarded as chief of them all. Although I do not wish to be understood as if I would demand that henceforth the sacred text should throughout, except in places manifestly erroneous, be edited in accordance with the readings of this document, yet there is no other that can more safely be used in determining the original text. Whilst, therefore, this Codex should be regarded as the chief authority in the field of biblical criticism, yet I do not think that attempts should be made to restore the original text by its aid alone, without at the same time diligently and conscientiously consulting the Vatican and other kindred witnesses of great antiquity. I have, moreover, not the slightest doubt that this Sinaitic treasure, providentially drawn forth from obscurity, and restored to light, will be of the highest value to the cause of sacred literature, and is destined to confirm the faith of those who revere what the holy apostles have written for the sake of eternal salvation and divine truth."

ARTICLE X.

AMERICAN COLLEGES.

Dr. Porter's book, entitled *American Colleges and the American Public*, meets a real want in the sentiment of this country. It will prove an admirable corrective of that senseless clamor, and vague demand for some change in the curriculum of college study, under the notion that the present course is not sufficiently practical. The bristling array of facts should be enough to put to rout the whole army of revolutionists in educational schemes.

As early as 1825, the Board of Harvard College adopted this resolution: "The University is open to persons who are not candidates for a degree, and desire to study in particular departments only." In spite of the unusual efforts, and great expectations of President Quincy, "in sixteen years, only eighteen students joined the College under this permission." The next year, 1826, under a strong pressure of public opinion, Amherst College adopted a plan of study, distinguished from the old course, by having "a more modern and national aspect." Note the result. The scheme never went any further than to be printed in one or two annual catalogues, with the names of a few special students. Yale tried the same experiment in 1827. Harvard repeated the trial in 1844, under the plan of an elective system, enforcing a prescribed curriculum till the end of the Freshman year, then allowing an entire discontinuance of Greek and Latin, and substituting various branches of science and history. The authors of the plan supposed that "a large body of students would be attracted to Cambridge;" but, in less than two years, the entire scheme was abandoned, and the College fell back to its old ways.

Perhaps the fairest experiment was made at Brown University, in 1850, under the influence of President Wayland, a pupil of Dr. Nott. By this plan, "the fixed term of four years, or any other term is to be abandoned, and every student is allowed to pursue as many, or as few courses of study as he may choose, subject to certain limitations. No general examination for admission to the University is prescribed." The plan was carried into effect with a degree of enthusiasm seldom witnessed; and we well remember a long and labored editorial by the Philosopher of the New York Tribune, predicting the speedy downfall of the whole scholastic system. Never was an experiment tried under more favorable circumstances. It was a pet scheme of the President. Its friends were ardent, hopeful, numerous and wealthy. To insure its undoubted success, a large additional teaching force was secured, and the funds of the College were increased by one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. With all these supporting influences, the plan signally failed, and Brown University has fallen back to the usual College curriculum. The significant words of President Wayland, uttered in 1842, in reference to the proposed changes at Harvard, were realized in his own Institution: "The Colleges which have obeyed the suggestions of the public, have failed to find themselves sustained by the public. So much easier is it to discover faults, than to amend them; to find out evils, than to remove them. And thus have we been taught, that the public does not always know what it wants, and that it is not always wise to take it at its word."

The latest experiment is that of Cornell University, the main features of which are strikingly similar to the plan tried in Harvard, forty years ago. There is scarcely a new feature in the system at Cornell, and they who are carried away with the idea, that some new, brilliant conception of education is about to be realized, exhibit their startling ignorance of our educational experiments. And notwithstanding the large number of students, and the imposing array of learned lecturers, we suspect the result at Cornell, will be the same as at Yale and Harvard. The following paragraph, go-

ing the round of the papers this very week, is exceedingly significant: "Those papers which were so extravagant in their laudation of Conrell University, are now just as unreasonable in their denunciation." We know what we are uttering, when we say, that Goldwin Smith is reading his learned prelections on History and Social Science, and Prof. Lowell is displaying his rhetorical pyrotechnics before scores of students, who, even apart from the Latin and Greek, could not enter the Freshman class of the poorest College in the land. We are not at all surprised, that Goldwin Smith is making arrangements to return to England, nor at the public announcement, that, "seven Professors have resigned at Cornell University."

Though these numerous experiments in education differ in minor features, they may all be reduced to two classes—the plan of elective studies, and the substitution of Modern languages or Physical Science in the place of the Ancient languages. The former system must necessarily fail. The Report of the late acting President of Harvard College, in 1868 and 1869, contains the following language: "The elective system has greatly disappointed its advocates. A large portion of the students make their election, not from any conscious taste or preference, but avowedly, from considerations of ease, or of rank, or of companionship. As the time for choice approaches, no question is more frequently discussed, than the higher or lower rate, at which the several instructors estimate equally good lessons. Also, the instructors are strongly tempted to do whatever is legitimately within their power to dissuade and discourage all, except quick and capable scholars, from entering their respective departments; and a student of slender ability, but with a sincere and discriminating love of learning, may find the course which he would prefer, virtually closed against him." The uniform result of the elective system has been, that the crowded recitation room of this week or term, is forsaken for an easier place the next, and that the room where the easier studies are pursued, is a kind of cess-pool, where gathers the scum of indolence and weakness. Young men, at the age when engaged in study,

are not competent to make an election. They do not yet know what is best for their intellectual good. President Eliott is not strictly correct when he says: "The young man of nineteen or twenty ought to know what he likes best, and is most fit for."

The second class of experiments is the substitution of something in the place of the ancient languages. The curriculum of study is fixed, and made definite, but may not the prescribed course be better fitted to the spirit and wants of the age, and at the same time accomplish the great end of education? In the experiments of this class, two kinds of substitutes have been tried, the Modern Languages and Physical Science. In reference to the former, Dr. Porter very conclusively shows that the French and German cannot take the place of the Latin and Greek, for the commanding objects for which language and the languages are studied in a course of education: (*a*) "They are not so good to teach attention to the structure of language, and thus to train the student to the intelligent and facile use of the English. (*b*) They are not so good for the discipline of the intellect. (*c*) They are not so good for the knowledge of man, which they directly and indirectly impart. (*d*) They are not as good as the ancient languages to prepare for the intelligent study of modern history. (*e*) They do not so efficiently further the intellectual and æsthetic culture of the student." Each of these propositions is established and illustrated by a train of thought, so that the question is settled almost beyond dispute, that in a course of study the Modern Languages cannot take the place of the Ancient.

But public opinion, changing its position of fault-finding, presses the further inquiry, why study language at all? Will not the physical sciences furnish as effective. and perhaps a more desirable culture, than the study of any language? We can not at present follow the train of remark by which the author meets this proposal, while not uttering a word in disparagement of those sciences, but expressing his highest admiration of their splendid results in art and life. The habits induced by those studies, and the tastes awakened are to be held in the highest estimation, "The nice eye for analysis,

the attentive eye for research, the enterprise and self-reliance required for open air excursions, the elevating influences that come from a contact with the purity and beauty of nature, and the habits of ready tact and rapid induction which such studies and researches involve, are all invaluable features of character, and leave priceless treasures for life." But they who have reached such results as these, have enjoyed a long preparatory training, and have become devotees and martyrs to the cause. It would be disastrous to the cause of education, to turn our colleges into special schools of science and technology. Those students in our highest scientific schools, who make the most rapid and successful progress in pure and applied science, are the graduates of our colleges; indeed, the best evidence of the value of our present collegiate system, may be found in those schools, where it frequently happens that "the well-trained graduate of a college, with strong scientific tastes, will often, in a few months, overtake and surpass his companion, who has had an apprenticeship for years in exclusively scientific studies."

The history of Agricultural Colleges in this country has a very decided bearing on this question. It is a singular and undisputed fact, that, in spite of the large endowments and the generous grants of land, there is not, in all the States, a single successful institution of this character. The course of study is largely made up of the Physical Sciences, and they can not be profitably pursued without a preliminary mental discipline. Those studies call into exercise powers of mind of a lofty character. Young men, of untrained faculties, soon become discouraged, when pressed at once in the high processes of Abstraction and Generalization. Hence these schools of Agricultural Science, founded in large endowments, starting out with a good teaching force, and sometimes with a goodly number of students, have, in a few months, been forsaken. Teachers have become discouraged, students have gone home to their farms, and here and there, all over the land, are deserted, lonely buildings—vast piles of useless brick and mortar—standing memorials to our people of the amazing folly of these educational schemes.

We are thus brought back to the conclusion, that for the commanding objects of education, all the recent proposed improvements are failures. Dr. Porter has summed up the merits of the present Collegiate System in so apt and admirable a manner, that we quote the entire passage. "The present College course has been arranged, not by theorists in education, nor by the traditional adherents to an hereditary system made sacred by hallowed associations, but under the just demands of public life as tested by long experience, and confirmed in the success of many generations. In this curriculum, the study of the Ancient languages has been prominent, as training to the power of subtle analysis; the mathematics, as strengthening to continuity and rigor of attention, to sharp and bold discrimination; physics, to give power over nature,—real power, as we wield and apply her forces; and intellectual, as we interpret her secrets, predict her phenomena, enforce her laws, and re-create her universe; psychology, that we may know ourselves, and so understand the instrument by which we know at all; ethics, that we may rightly direct the springs of action, and subject the individual will to the consecrating law of duty; political science, that we may know the state as to the grounds and limits of its authority: the science of religion, that we may justify our faith to the disciplined and instructed reason; history, that we may trace the development of man and the moral purposes of God; logic, rhetoric and literature, that the powers thus enriched and thus trained, may express themselves aptly and skillfully by writing and in speech."

The reader of this notice will not infer that this topic, the course of Collegiate study, is the only one discussed in Dr. Porter's book. Other subjects, of great and pressing importance, are taken up, such as the Enforcement of Fidelity, The Dormitory System, Educational Reform, The Common Life of the College, &c., thus making it a volume of more than ordinary interest. The friends of solid education throughout the country are under great obligations to Prof. Porter

for his timely and clear utterances on these subjects, and as long as the American College shall be on trial at the bar of public opinion, we cheerfully accept him as our attorney and advocate.

ARTICLE XI.

"BOOK OF WORSHIP," PUBLISHED BY THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

This Book reaches us after the material for this number of the REVIEW was all prepared, and nearly all printed, so that there is neither time nor space for a lengthy notice. And yet its importance, and the interest the Church feels in the matter, seem to require something more than an ordinary notice of a few lines. The preparation and introduction of a new Hymn Book, is always an important event with any denomination. Often it marks an epoch in the religious history of a people. The appearance of this new Book has been anticipated with more than usual interest by a very large part of the Church. At length it has appeared, and as something more than a mere collection of hymns, it is styled "*Book of Worship.*"

As one of the Editors, and also one of the Asssociate Editors, of the REVIEW, were on the Committe to prepare this Book, it is only due to them to say that they are entirely innocent of this criticism. They allow others to judge and speak of their work.

The first thing that strikes us, in taking up the Book, is its very neat appearance. It is, indeed, more than simply neat—it is really beautiful. The exterior and interior—the paper, printing, arrangement, binding—are very attractive. The whole appearance of the Book is all that the most fastidious

could desire. We have never seen any similar book gotten out in better style, and we doubt if any denomination can boast its equal. Too much can hardly be said in praise of the taste with which this Book has been published. Without anything that is flashy or tawdry, it has all the grace and finish that make it a delight to handle and look upon. To suit every variety of taste, it is finished in a great variety of styles of binding and external adornment.

The contents correspond well with the external appearance, and if we may be allowed the use of a Scripture expression, we would say, it "is like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

The selection of hymns is very choice. Of the hymns in the old book, we believe, without actual count, that somewhat over six hundred have been omitted. This may seem a very large number to be rejected, but a tolerably lengthy trial of them had proved their unsuitableness for the purpose of singing in the sanctuary, and they have given way to others. To the nearly four hundred of the old hymns retained, the Committee have added over two hundred new ones, and among these will be found some of the sweetest and most touching sacred lyrics in our language. The new hymns constitute one of the most valuable additions in this Book of Worship. The Committee no doubt found great difficulty in selecting from the vast amount of material that has accumulated in this department, and might easily have increased their number many fold. But their aim was not to present a collection of all the hymns that are passable, but to make a select book for Christian worship. And they have done their work well. There are other hymns which we would be glad to have, that are not in this Book; and perhaps a few that we would be willing to spare or exchange for others. But this is a matter of taste and judgment, and we are glad of so many excellent, and so few poor ones. It is a rich treasure of Christian song.

We would be glad if we had time to point out, and invite special attention to, a number of these new hymns on different topics. As it is, we cannot forbear citing a few, though

it may not be doing justice to others of perhaps equal merit. Every earnest Christian will be glad to find, heading the table of first lines, that stirring hymn of Charles Wesley,

"A charge to keep I have,
A God to glorify."

The truly penitent believer will rejoice that in this Book he can sing,

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy Blood was shed for me!"

and that he can, taking refuge in Christ, add,

"My faith looks up to Thee,
Thou Lamb of Calvary!"

Such hymns, so full of the deepest feelings of the soul, and of the all-sufficiency of Christ, cannot but meet a hearty welcome. They are repeated and sung wherever they are known.

"Nearer my God to Thee,
Nearer to Thee!"

and—

"No, no, it is not dying,
To go unto our God!"

touch a chord in our hearts and tune them to the music of heaven. But we must forbear. There are so many beautiful new hymns scattered through the Book, that it is impossible to give anything like a proper idea of them by a few specimens. They are not confined to a single or a few topics, but extend to nearly every subject embraced in the range of such a work, and those who use the Book will find it abounding in hymns to suit the heart, in all its varied experience, as it comes before God in solemn worship.

The arrangement of hymns in this Book is entirely different from that in the old one, and is much more systematic and orderly. The proper order of arrangement is a point about which there is some room for difference of opinion, but that chosen by the committee is perhaps as simple and as good as any that could have been selected. The Book opens, very

properly, with Worship, and with the most appropriate piece for the purpose, in the language:

> "Before Jehovah's awful throne
> Ye nations bow with sacred joy;"

That grand Old Hundreth Psalm, so magnificently rendered by Watts, is almost out of place anywhere else, and any other here would be tame beside it. It strikes the key note of reverential and sublime worship. The subjects succeed each other according to their natural order, and each hymn finds its appropriate place under the proper head. This greatly facilitates the work of hunting hymns on any general subject. In addition to the *Table of Contents* at the beginning, there is a very carefully prepared topical *Index of Subjects*, appended, following the selection of hymns, so that hymns on particular subjects may be easily found. The selection and classification of hymns, as well as the arrangement and preparation of the *Table of Contents* and *Index of Subjects*, have evidently all been made with the greatest care, and seems greatly to enhance the value of this Book of Song.

But this is more than simply a collection of hymns. It is a *Book of Worship*. Preceding the hymns is an "*Order of Public Worship*," consisting of a *Sabbath Morning and Evening Service*. These are not cumbersome or tedious, and leave the general prayer, as well as the selections of Scripture to be read, to the option of the minister. There is thus room for the exercise of individual taste and judgment, combined with some degree of churchly order and uniformity. In regard to the use of this service, we have no doubt there will be considerable difference of opinion, and the Augsburg Confession happily declares that "it is not necessary that the same rites and ceremonies should be everywhere observed." It is to be hoped, however, that this Book will aid in producing more uniformity in our churches, without burdening the consciences of any, or restraining true Christian freedom in worship.

Appended to the hymns are some Family Prayers, consisting of prayers for morning and evening of each day, for one week. These will supply a felt want with many individuals and

families. Whatever may be said for or against forms of prayer, it is certain that many desire them, and they have the sanction of many of the very best men in nearly all churches. We should be sorry indeed if they were used to supplant extemporaneous prayer, but we believe they will serve rather to increase it, and that some, at least, will be induced to conduct family worship, who would otherwise be unwilling to undertake it.

Luther's Smaller Catechism, the Augsburg Confession, and the Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, complete the volume. As we cannot speak of these fully, we will only say, that in such a Book, we would prefer to have the Catechism without any additions or explanations, and think that the revision of the Formula should be completed, so as to make the whole harmonious, and to accord with the present position of most of our Synods and of the General Synod. The revision, thus far, has only extended to the Constitution of the General Synod, and the Formula for Churches, leaving that relating to Synods unaltered. This has been an oversight in the action of the General Synod, and will, doubtless, be remedied in due time.

The Book, as a whole, we endorse, and as a Lutheran, are proud of it. Doubtless some flaws might be picked in it, but we have been so impressed with its excellences as to overlook any defects that may be found in it. A more extended criticism may appear in the next number of the Review. In the meantime the Book of Worship, ordered by our General Synod, cannot fail to commend itself to the candid consideration and impartial judgment of all our ministers and people, and prove an important means for furthering the spirit of true Christian worship.

ARTICLE XII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

A good degree of literary activity has marked the last few months. Without taking into account the numerous holiday books, which are scarcely ever of any special importance in the progress of letters, the press has issued a great many works of merit and importance. The books of the quarter have been creditable and useful rather than extraordinary.

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological.—In the appearance of the fourth volume of *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, as edited by H. B. Hackett, D. D., and E. Abbott, LL. D., we have the completion of this great thesaurus of Biblical information. With this work, and that of Kitto, little else of the kind could be desired by the student of the Scriptures. We have also a carefully revised edition of Mr. Stephen Hawes' valuable *Synchronology of the Principal Events in Sacred and Profane History*, from the Creation of Man to the present time. Another volume of the translation of Lange's great *Commentary* has been issued, comprising Galatians, Phillippians and Colossians. A new book is furnished in *The Theology of Christ*, by Rev. J. P. Thompson, D. D., an evolution of doctrine from Christ's own words ; also in *Bible Thoughts and Themes*, a series of eighty-five lectures on various passages of the Lesser Epistles, by Dr. H. Bonar. The able and suggestive *Life of Christ*, by Dr. Hanna, has been completed in the issue, by Carter & Bros., of the third volume. J. B. Lippincott & Co. have introduced to the American public a large English work, Blunt's *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, in which everything is viewed from the standpoint of High Church Anglicanism, and in too much of a partizan and narrow spirit to be trustworthy for reference. The second and concluding volume of the *Origin and Development of Religious Belief*, by S. Baring-Gould, has been published by D. Appleton & Co., and treats of *Christianity*, as the first, whose appearance attracted some attention a year or so ago, did of *Heathenism and Judaism*.

Rev. Gerard Molley, a theologian of the Romish Church, has given us a new discussion of the subject, *Geology and Revelation*, in which the ancient history of the earth is considered in the light of geological facts and revealed religion.

A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament, by the late Charles F. Hudson, revised and completed by Dr. Ezra Abbott, of

Cambridge, is designed to supply, in cheap and compact form, the information most necessary in searching the Scriptures.

It is announced that Gould & Lincoln will soon publish a translation of *The Bremen Lectures*, on Fundamental Living Questions, a volume embodying the latest theological thought of Germany, and comprising, among other topics, The Biblical Account of Creation, and Natural Science, Reason, Conscience and Revelation, Miracles; The Person of Jesus Christ; The Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement; and Christianity and Culture,—the authors being Drs. Lange, Tischendorf, Uhlhorn, Zöchler, Luthardt, Gess, and others. To make a 12mo. volume of 400 pp.

The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, as represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the History and Literature of the Evangelical Protestant (the Lutheran) Church, by Charles P. Krauth. D. D., was announced for issue in October, but we have, as yet, seen no notice of its appearance.

Leypoldt & Holt are expecting soon to issue *The Talmud*, by Emanuel Deutsche, which has been long promised.

The University Publishing Company, of New York, announce a book which, we have every reason to believe, will be one of rare ability and value, entitled *Jesus: His Life and Work*, as narrated by the Four Evangelists, by Dr. Howard Crosby, Chancellor of the University of New York. The known learning and fidelity to truth, of the author, guarantee, in this work, a real contribution to Christian theology.

W, F. Draper, of Andover, has published *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*; A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations, by J. B. Lightfoot, D. D., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and *The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, translated from the German of Professor W. F. Gess.

Historical and Biographical.—The first volume of Dr. Pressense's *Early Years of the Christian Church*,—the whole work designed to be completed in four volumes—has been given to the American public by Charles Scribner & Co. Also the final volume of Mommsen's great work, the *History of Rome*, containing a copious index to the whole; the eleventh and twelfth volumes of Mr. Fronde's *History of England*, and a cheap edition of his *Short Studies on Great Subjects*.

An important addition to our knowledge of the social and mental condition of savages, has been made by Sir John Lubbock, in *The Origin of Civilization, and the Primitive Condition of Man*, from the press of D. Appleton & Co. The author, though a learned and industrious collector of facts, is often unsafe in his judgments, and presents conclusions on the moral and religious aspects of the subject unwarranted by the given data.

Prof. Gillett's very valuable history of *John Huss and His Times*, has appeared, from the press of Gould & Lincoln, in a new edition, enlarged by a valuable appendix, and the insertion of new and important matter in the body of the work.

Two new works have appeared on the history of missions. In the first, under the title of *A Heathen Nation Evangelized*, Dr. Rufus Anderson, formerly Secretary of the Board of Missions, has given to the public, through the Congregational Publication Society, what is regarded as a most valuable and satisfactory history of the wonderful Christianization of the Sandwich Islands. In the second, *Christian Missions*, by T. W. M. Marshall, once an Anglican clergyman, but perverted to Romanism, we have a work so full of misrepresentations and abuse, as to be utterly unreliable and valueless as history.

J. B. Lippincott & Co. have lately published, from advance sheets, *The Life of Lord Palmerston*, by Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, in two volumes.

Dr. Shelton Mackenzie has placed the public under obligation by his most interesting *Life of Charles Dickens.*

Noyes, Holmes & Co. announce for early publication *The History of Printing.*

A *History of Paraguay*, in two volumes, by ex-Minister Washburn, is annonnced as nearly ready. Lee & Shepherd.

Scientific and Philosophical.—Prof. Hart, of Cornell University, has given to the public, through Fields, Osgood & Co., *The Geology and Physical Geography of Brazil*, one of the results of Prof. Agassiz's expedition up the Amazon several years ago. *Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews*, by the renowned English Scientist, Mr. T. H. Huxley, embracing the famous paper on "Protoplasm," or "The Physical Basis of Life," published for American readers by D. Appleton & Co., will be sought after by many persons who do not accept his dark materialistic Atheism. Along with this, by the same house, we are furnished with a new American edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, published by arrangement with the author, and containing his latest additions and revisions. Also, Darwin's new book on *The Descent of Man*, and on *Selections in Relation to Sex.* Astronomical inquiry has received another able contribution in *Other Worlds than Ours*, by Richard A. Proctor, F. R. A. S., of England, from the press of D. Appleton & Co., in which the plurality of worlds is examined under the light of recent scientific investigations.

The *Outline of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, by Rev. J. Clark Murray, with an Introduction by Dr. Jas. McCosh, will afford the student a view of the complete system of that eminent psychologist, without reading all his extended discussions.

Three volumes have lately been added to Scribner's Illustrated Library of Wonders, which is popularizing, in a most attractive way, so much from the fields of Science and Art, viz: *Balloon Ascents, Bodily Strength and Skill*, and *The Bottom of the Sea.* The Professor of Physiological Chemistry in Yale College, George F. Barker, M. D., has furnished a new work of *Elementary Chemistry, Theoretical and Inorganic*, designed to supply a text-book in which that Science is brought forward to the latest results of investigation.

The *Descriptive Mineralogy*, by Prof. Dana, has appeared in a new and enlarged edition, comprising the most recent discoveries.

Religious, Practical and Devotional.—The press have been sending forth a great many books of this kind. Specially numerous have been the works issued for the young. In glancing over the lists as they appear, one cannot but be impressed with the strength of current with which book-making has turned into this channel. Of the multitudinous practical and devotional issues, only a few of the most noticeable can be mentioned.

As of closest interest to our Church, and of great importance, is the fact that the Lutheran Publication Board has issued the new *Book of Worship*, revised by order of the General Synod, and two additional volumes of the "Fatherland Series," *The Iron Age of Germany*, and *Prince Wolfgang*, all of which are noticed elsewhere in this number.

The energetic house of Robert Carter & Bros,, have issued a new and cheap edition of Bonar's "*Hymns of Faith and Hope*," and many interesting books for the young.

Culture and the Gospel, by Rev. S. M'Call, of Old Saybrook, Conn., is a "Plea for the Sufficiency of the Gospel to meet the wants of an Enlightened Age."

The English-reading Church will be glad to know that a translation has been made, and published, of Dr. Tholuck's *Hours of Christian Devotion*—a work of genius in the line of devotional writing—issued by the Carters.

As a guide to reading, Dr. Noah Porter, of Yale College, has furnished an excellent directory in *Books and Reading*, or What shall I read, and How shall I read Them?

Statistical, &c.—The Editors of the *New York Observer* announce what promises to be a book of rare value, *Year Book and Almanac*, prepared at great expense, and containing, for reference, an immense amount of information useful to every citizen, Astronomical, Commercial, Agricultural, Ecclesiastical, and Educational.

BRITISH.

Among British Books, but few are to be noted.

Biblical and Theological.—The first volume of the authorized *Church of England Commentary* on the Bible, has been published by Murray. It comprises the Pentateuch, and is a massive and closely printed 8vo. of 800 pages.

In *Essays*, Chiefly on Questions of Church and State, from 1850 to 1870, by A. P. Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster, the author discusses, from the stand-point of liberalism, many of the recent theological and ecclesiastical topics.

The Bampton Lectures for 1870, by Rev. Dr. W. J. Irons, on the subject, *Christianity as taught by St. Paul*, form one volume 8vo. with map. Dr. Irons, once regarded as "High Church," has been left behind by the ritualists, and is now counted "Moderate." His work is considered one of the most elaborate expositions of St. Paul's teaching lately produced in England.

The Boyle Lectures for 1870 are *The Witness of St. John to Christ*, with appendix on the authorship and integrity of St. John's Gospel, and the unity of the Johannine writings, by Rev. Stanley Leathers, Hebrew Professor at King's College.

Sacred Archæology has received an important contribution in Dr. C. D. Ginsbury's work on *The Moabite Stone*, being a full account of this memorable relic, so wonderfully preserved till found, and then so sadly destroyed.

Of the same kind is *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, an account of the recent Excavations and Discoveries in the Holy City, by Capts. Wilson and Warren.

Of works announced, we may mention, *Ths Seventh Seal*, or the Time of Trouble begun, by Dr. Cummings; *The Truth of the Bible*, Evidence from the Mosaic and other Records, &c., by Rev. B. W. Saville; and *Traditions of Eden*, or Proofs of the Historical Truth of the Pentateuch, &c., by Rev. H. Shepheard.

Historical.—Valuable contributions have been made in a new volume of collected Essays by Dean Milman; *The Revolt of the Protestants of the Cevennes*, with some account of the Huguenots of the seventeenth century, by Mrs. Bray; a new and elegant edition of Mr. Sharpe's *History of Egypt*, and the second volume of Sir Edward Creasy's *History of England.*

Philosophy and General Literature.—*Lectures on Art*, by John Ruskin, M. A., delivered before the University of Oxford, 1870, have been published by the Clarendon Press.

Dr. M'Cosh's *Laws of Discursive Thought*, has been issued in London by Macmillan.

An Examination of the Utilitarian Philosophy, by the late John Grote, B. D., Prof. of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, edited by J. B. Mayor, M. A., is published at Cambridge.

Chips from a German Workshop, by Prof. Max Müller, is just completed in the appearance of the third volume.

GERMAN.

Our inability to secure the German Periodicals in time for this number, has made it necessary to postpone to the next the Literary Intelligence from Germany.

ARTICLE XIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION BOARD, NO. 42 NORTH 9TH ST., PHILA.

THE IRON AGE OF GERMANY, pp. 236. This is the eighteenth volume of "The Fatherland Series." It is a story of the "Thirty Years' War," and full of interest. The Historic Sketch by Dr. C. P. Krauth, making nearly one third of the volume, adds to the value of the book. It is a volume not simply to interest the young, by its exciting story, but to instruct young and old.

WOLFGANG, PRINCE OF ANEALT, pp. 316. Another of this interesting series. This is also accompanied by a brief Historic Sketch of the hero of the book. No one can read this volume without profit as well as pleasure. Wolfgang is one of the characters that will live through all time, and it is well to have the young better acquainted with him. We are at a loss to understand why the translator gives us sometimes "Fürst Wolfgang," and at others "Prince Wolfgang." It is calculated to perplex youthful readers. It seems to us, too, that in an English translation there is no occasion for "Mein Herr," or other German expressions. Many readers will know as little of the meaning of Mein Herr, as they would of the balance of the book in German. Such things are blemishes in translations, that ought to be avoided. These issues of the Board of Publication, are attracting the attention of others outside of our Church. They are deservedly popular, for they are superior to much of the literature provided for Sunday Schools and for youthful readers. They should find their way into Sunday Schools and thousands of families.

SCHULTZE & GASSMAN, COLUMBUS, O.

ESSAY ON THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE, by Rev. M. Loy, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio. pp 247. This volume is a pretty full discussion of the Ministerial Office, from one who has made it a special study, and who is consequently prepared to present his views in the best manner. The question of the *ministry* is a very exciting one to some theologians, and in some parts of the Lutheran Church. Others fail to see the importance, or to become deeply interested in the discussion. With Prof. Loy it is clearly a subject of special moment. In this volume he reprints, revised and put in book form, what he had furnished the Church on this subject in the REVIEW some years ago. The points discussed are I. The

Nature of the Ministy. II. The Call to the Ministry. III. Ordination to the Ministry. The views advocated are essentially the same as those maintained by the Missouri Synod, and in direct opposition to the views of the Buffalo Synod. They may be designated as the "*low Church*" views. For, whilst the men of this party may be "high Church," in some things, they are opposed to any extravagant notions of the Ministry as an order. It seems to us that these views are pressed to an extreme that does not harmonize with the divine word, or or conduce to the best interests of the Church. We accord to Prof. Loy zeal and diligence in his advocacy of his side of the question, but confess ourselves not converted to his views, so far as they are peculiar. Without going to either extreme, we find, what seems to us a position more scriptural, and cumbered with fewer difficulties, either theoretical or practical. Of course, with all the question should be, what do the Scriptures teach; and with us, as Lutherans, what is the true theory of our Church. As on these points, different opinions prevail, we commend this volume of Prof. Loy, as worthy of a careful study.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Received through Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

LIGHT AND TRUTH: or Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Lesser Epistles, by Horatius Bonar, D. D. pp. 437.

HYMNS OF FAITH AND HOPE, 3 vols., by H. Bonar, D. D.

The devotional works of Dr. Bonar, have secured a deservedly high reputation. They combine literary excellence with deep spiritual earnestness. His Hymns of Faith and Hope, so many of which are used in the "service of song" in the sanctuaries of all denominations, have endeared his name to the Christian Church.

LIGHT AND TRUTH, is worthy of his Christian head and heart. It consists of brief practical lectures on no less than eighty-five texts, or passages, of the smaller New Testament Epistles. Their method is textual and expository, exhibiting excellent exegetical judgment and fervent piety. They are marked by great directness and suggestiveness. The lectures are not all of equal excellence, but many of them are illustrations of most happy and impressive practical exposition.

DOWN THE STEPS, by the author of "Squire Downing's Heirs," &c. pp. 409.

A spirited story, exhibiting the power of temptation, the misery and ruin of yielding to it, and the need of divine grace for the safety of youthful character. It is an excellent book to be put into the hands of the young, to fortify them against the snares of sin.

ROSE MARBURY, by S. J. Pritchard, pp. 304. The lessons of kindness, patience, and love, and the blessedness of true piety, are impressively set forth in this little volume. A feature of special excellence is, that it is pervaded by the real teaching of the Gospel. There should be more of the cardinal truths of Christianity put into the books for the young.

Hyacinthe and Her Brothers, by Johanna H. Mathews, Author of the "Bessie Book." pp. 203.

A well written Juvenile, and well suited, as it is intended, to impress children with the wrong and meanness of teasing and tormenting one another.

Little Primrose: or The Bells of old Effingham, by Emma Marshall, 18mo. p. 146.

A sweet story of Christian kindness, showing how loving effort among the lowly and neglected, becomes effectual in leading to hear the precious invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest."

Christie Ellwood and Her Friends. pp. 270.

The story of this book is very touching, and furnishes numerous illustrations of the richness and wonder-working power of divine grace. There is more in it of Christ and His love, than in many more pretending volumes. The reading of it sets the heart aglow.

HENRY HOYT, BOSTON.

Received through T. N. Kurtz, Baltimore.

Charity Hurlburt. pp. 390. This volumes illustrates, in a very interesting and impressive manner, the great lesson of charity, as set forth by the apostle in 1 Cor. 13. The narrative is quite natural, and contains lessons that are of great value to all.

Into the Highways. pp. 359. This story of a young pastor, and his sister, is one of absorbing interest. The lessons of self-denial and Christian activity are set forth by examples well calculated to awaken our sympathy and lead to the exercise of the same virtues.

Queen Rhoda. pp. 333. How grace may overcome the natural enmity of the heart, assist our infirmities, and enable us, amidst inward conflicts and outward temptations, to press onward in the Christian life, is happily portrayed in this attractive story.

Snail Shell Harbor. pp. 390. This purports to be a true picture from real life. The scene is laid in the Lake Superior copper region. In the history of Snaill Shell Harbor, from a single family to a thrifty village and county seat, it illustrates the wonderful transforming power of the Gospel.

The Old Oak Farm. pp. 204. This is a story of a Protestant boy exposed to the cruel persecutions and craft of Romanists, who sought to seduce him from his faith. His steadfastness to principles happily illustrates the Christian character.

Carmina Cœli. pp. 151. This beautiful volume contains a collection of some of the best known and sweetest "songs of heaven." Beginning with "Jerusalem the golden," and ending with "My days are gliding swiftly by," it embraces a number of the choicest gems of sacred song relating to our heavenly home and the bliss of the redeemed.

IVISON, BLAKEMAN, TAYLOR & CO.: NEW YORK.

ROBINSON'S FIRST LESSONS IN MENTAL AND WRITTEN ARITHMETIC. On the Objective Method. A most excellent little Arithmetic, making the study really attractive to beginners.

GREEK PRAXIS, or Greek for Beginners, containing Orthography, Etymology, and Greek Reading Lessons, together with Notes, and a Vocabulary, by J. A. Spencer, S. T. D., Prof. of Greek in the College of the city of New York. The matter of this book has been very judiciously and carefully arranged, forming one of the very best manuals for instruction, for such teachers as employ the method of advancing, in linguistic study, from simpler to more extended grammars. But in the practice of passing from one grammar to another, much of the student's time is taken up in simply memorizing in a new form his previous information and rules, and the unity and compactness of his work is broken up. We believe, that for beginners, as well as for others, the best Greek Grammar, is that which is most thorough and complete—in which the student's way is one of unbroken and consistent progress to the limits of his course.

LITERATURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, comprising Representative selections from the Best Authors, also lists of Contemporaneous Writers and their principal works, by E. Hunt, LL. D., Head Master, Girls' High and Normal School, Boston. pp. 640. This selection from standard American and English authors, is designed to introduce the pupils, for whose use it is prepared, to some of the best pieces in our language, and to make them a study. The author does not follow the more common chronological order, but starts with "our most distinguished modern authors first." The volume is a valuable additions to our school books of this character.

ELEMENTS OF COMPOSITION AND RHETORIC, by Simon Kerl, A. M. pp. 408. This is an elementary treatise, and we think rather tedious by its multiplicity of examples, and details to aid the learner. If one had patience to learn and practice all that is presented, he would, doubtless, be benefited by the drill.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE: An Episode of the 13th century, by George Zabriskie Gray. pp. 238. A very interesting book, and beautifully gotten out. Among the strange and almost incredible movements for the rescue of the Holy Land, during the Middle Ages, the Children's Crusade formed a truly wonderful "episode" of history. But, barren of results, and overshadowed by stirring contemporaneous events, little has been recorded about it. Mr. Gray has searched out, and brought together all attainable information, and made a most interesting contribution to our knowledge of the strange movement. It is a book to be recommended.

FIRST STEPS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE, by Arthur Gilman, A. M. This small volume seems well adapted for the purpose indicated in the title.

COUGHS AND COLDS. By Dr. W. W. Hall. pp. 362. If this book were

carefully read, and the advice it contains followed, much suffering might be avoided, and many lives probably spared. Dr. Hall's writings are marked by good sense, and a freedom from everything like quackery.

The Choice of Paris. By S. G. W. Benjamin. pp. 342. This is designed to be a classical Romance. It carries the reader back to the earliest days of Grecian story. We are made to move again among the scenes and characters immortalized in tragedy and song. The volume will, doubtless, interest a large class of readers.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

A School History of the United States, from the discovery of America to the year 1870. By David B. Scott. pp. 425. This new school history is somewhat lavishly embellished with engravings, and supplied with maps. If the teacher will fill up this comprehensive outline, by interesting conversations, the volume will answer a valuable purpose. But it is rather too much of a skeleton for interesting or general reading. We are not quite certain that we understand the author's meaning in the following statement: "From what place these red men first came, peopling the continent from the North to Cape Horn, is not yet ascertained. * * But the general opinion seems to be, that the Indian is a distinct race from those of the Old World."

An Index to Harper's New Monthly Magazine, vols. I to XL, from June, 1850, to May, 1870. The design of the Publishers, in issuing this volume, has been to furnish a complete Index—Alphabetical, Analytical, and Topical—for the first forty volumes of this widely circulated and popular Magazine—as fresh and vigorous now as ever, and still holding its high rank among multiplied competitors.

This Index should be in the hands of every one who possesses these volumes of the Magazine, or any considerable number of them. It is no mere jumble, or massed collection of general contents, but is arranged on clear principles of correct order and system. The Index will make available, for reference, the immense amount of valuable matter—a thesaurus of useful and entertaining knowledge—in the forty volumes of this magazine.

A. S. BARNES & CO, NEW YORK.

Songs for the Sanctuary: or Hymns and Tunes for Christian Worship. By Rev. Charles Robinson. This is a revised edition of the "Songs of the Church," prepared originally for use in the Author's own congregation. The experience of several years' use, has suggested and led to the improved form in which this Manual is now presented. It is admirably adapted to accomplish its design to promote congregational singing. There are brought together in it over thirteen hundred Hymns, among which we recognize most of the best ancient, mediæval, modern, and recent Hymns. The music, placed at the top of the page, consists mainly, as it must in every good collection, of well-tried and familiar tunes—found by long use to be fit bearers of the spirit and flow of worship. Fifty-four selections for

chanting are added at the close, such as the Lord's Prayer, Apostles' Creed, Gloria Patri, Psalms, &c.

We are glad of the appearance of this revised edition. The author's good judgment and taste are evident throughout. Besides its appropriate use in the sanctuary, the book should find a place in the family circle in all churches. It will invite to, and aid in, the cultivation of sacred song.

T. B. PETERSON & BROS., PHILADELPHIA.

LIFE OF CHARLES DICKENS, by R. Shelton Mackenzie, LL. D., Literary Editor of the "Philadelphia Press." pp. 484. The career of Mr. Dickens, as a writer, has been so marked and brilliant, that a complete history of it becomes a literary necessity. Of the various biographical sketches, given to the public, this one, by Dr. Mackenzie, is the best. Written in the spirit of true enthusiasm for the great Novelist, it affords us a most complete view of his life. It is clear, discriminating, racy and able,—full of lively incidents and apt illustrations, mirroring the real life of this "man of letters and man of the people."

A full account of the Funeral Services, Dean Stanley's Funeral Sermon, and Mr. Dicken's Will, are included.

Every admirer of Mr. Dickens will feel that he must read this work. The favorable judgment of it by the public, is, perhaps, best reflected in a statement by an English journal, "Dr. Mackenzie's Life of Dicken has reached a sale of 40,000 copies."

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.

From Mr. Thissell, General Agent, Philadelphia, we have the COMPANION TO THE BIBLE, by Prof. E. P. Barrows, D. D., and the ATTRACTIONS OF THE CROSS, by Dr. Spring. The latter of these volumes is too well known to need any special account of it in the REVIEW. The subject is one of which the Christian can never weary, and the popularity of the work proves that Dr. Spring has succeeded in presenting it in an attractive form.

The other volume—the Companion to the Bible—we regard as one of the most valuable works yet issued by this great catholic Society. It is a work for the scholar, as well as for common readers. Indeed, we do not know any single volume, that, in the same compass, contains more reliable information about the Bible. It is impossible, in a brief notice, to convey any just idea of the wide compass it embraces, or the amount of matter which it contains. Without wearying the reader with all the details, it furnishes him with the best results in regard to most of the investigations on Biblical Science. It consists of four parts—I. A concise view of the Evidences of Revealed Religion. II. An Introduction to the Old Testament. III. An Introduction to the New Testament. IV. A Discussion of the principles of Biblical Interpretation. As a manual for ministers and intelligent laymen, or for all engaged in the study of the Bible, and who desire more complete information about the Book of books, we cordially recommend this volume.

J. C. GARRIGUES & CO. PHILADELPHIA.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL IDEA: An Exposition of the Principles which underlie the Sunday School cause, setting forth its Objects, Organization, Methods and Capabilities. By John S. Hart, LL. D., Senior Editor of The Sunday School Times, &c., &c. pp. 416. Like everything from the pen of Dr. Hart, this book is characterized by good common sense and great practical wisdom. The style is simple and vigorous, and the volume abounds in weighty truths well put. It is one of the encouraging signs of progress in the Sunday School work, that so much attention is bestowed, by thoughtful men, on the method of teaching, and the true "*Sunday School idea.*" Dr. Hart sets up a much higher standard and aim for Sunday Schools than have too generally prevailed, and yet none to high. "The first great aim," he says, "undoubtedly, is to bring the scholars to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ—to secure their conversion." If all who are concerned in this great work, would carefully read this volume, they would have a higher appreciation of the importance and value of Sunday Schools. We say to all, buy this book, and read it—study it, and put its lessons into practice.

FORMELBUCH FÜR EVANGELISCHE-LUTHERISCHE GEMEINDEN IN AMERIKA. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Pastor J. D. Severinghaus. Oswego, N. Y. 1870. A small, unpretending volume of seventy pages, partly original, partly selected. The character of the book may be learned from its table of contents. I. Order of Worship. II. Reception of new members. III. Various Formulas—Organization of new congregations, Uniting with a Synod, Calling a Pastor, &c. IV. Church-discipline. V. Constitution for Churches. VI. Constitulion for Sunday Schools. VII. Rules for a Singing Society. VIII. The Brotherhood. IX. The Sisterhood. X. Constitution of the General Synod. In a convenient form we here have much useful matter for German Churches and Pastors. New organizations, especially, will find the formulas and constitutions important aids.

ERKLÄRUNG DES KLEINEN EVANG. KATECHISMUS DER DEUTSCH-EVANG. SYNOD DES WESTENS. Von Andreas Irion, weil. Prof. der Theologie und Inspector des evang. Missouri-Seminars. Herausgegeben von Friederich Kauffman, Prof. der Theologie am evang. Missouri-Seminar. St. Louis, Mo. 1870. This work is presented to the public by Rev. F. Kauffman, successor in the Theological Professorship, to Prof. Irion, and consists of Prof. Irion's *Explanation of the Evangelical Catechism of the Evang. Synod of the West.* The Catechism is based upon the Smaller Catechism of Luther, and this commentary upon it, of which we have received the first instalment of sixty-four pages, (covering the decalogue and part of the first article of the creed,) is the substance of the author's lectures upon it, delivered to his classes in the Theological Seminary. Although not occupying a strictly confessional position, the author is more decidedly evangelical than the Catechism upon which he comments.

CONTENTS OF NO. I.

Article. Page.

I. The Review, ... 1

II. Systematic Benevolence, ... 13
By Rev. C. A. Stork, A. M., Baltimore, Md.

III. The History of Protestant Theology, ... 21
Translated by S. Sprecher, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

IV. Socrates and Arnold, or the Ancient and Modern Teacher, ... 34
By Rev. T. H. Robinson, D. D., Harrisburg, Pa.

V. Method of Studying the English Language, ... 57
By Prof. Edsall Ferrier, A. M., of Pennsylvania College.

VI. Reason not a Rule of Faith, ... 67
By Rev. Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

VII. The Relation of the Sunday School to the Church, 97
By Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, A. M., Whitemarsh, Pa., Editor of "The Lutheran Sunday-School Herald."

VIII. Prof. Dr. J. T. Beck, of Tubingen, and his views of the Word of God, ... 111
By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Pittsburg, Pa.

IX. The Codex Sinaiticus, ... 122
By Charles A. Hay, D. D., of Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

X. American Colleges,..... 140

XI. Book of Worship,..... 146

XII. Literary Intelligence,..... 151

Biblical and Theological—Historical and Biographical—Scientific and Philosophical—Riligious, Practical, and Devotional.

XIII. Notices of New Publications,..... 156

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

APRIL, 1871.

ARTICLE I.

THE THEISTIC ARGUMENT FROM FINAL CAUSES.

Pater Mundi; or, Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father. Being, in substance, Lectures Delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College, by Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., in Two Volumes. Boston: Nichols & Noyes.

Religion and Chemistry; or, Proofs of God's Plan in the Atmosphere and its Elements. Ten Lectures, delivered at the Brooklyn Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., on the Graham Foundation. By Josiah P. Cooke, Jr., Erving Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy in Harvard University. New York: Charles Scribner.

Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation, by Rev. James McCosh, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Mathematics in the Queen's University in Ireland, (now President of the College of New Jersey) and George Dickie, A. M., M. D., Professor of Natural History in the Queen's University, Ireland. New York: Robert Carter & Bros.

The existence of God is the underlying truth of all religion. It conditions all worship. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is." Though it is a truth of Natural

Theology, it lays the deep foundation of Christianity. The natural is not superseded in the revealed, but remains beneath the divine superstructure, like the granite rock of the earth carrying forever the superimposed formations. Revelation begins, not by seeking to prove, but by building on, the doctrine of the existence of God: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." His existence is assumed as known. Its evidence is recognized as manifest apart from the announcement of it by revelation. This gives to Natural Theology a grand and ceaseless importance. It can never lose its value or interest. Christianity confirms its teaching, and brings to us the additional truth, by which God shines into the hearts of men, to give them the light of a true and saving knowledge of Himself. But the more clearly and widely the light of the Gospel may shine, the more plainly it must be seen how much this first truth of natural religion underlies and supports.

It is not surprising that, in apprehending and presenting the evidences of this great truth of both natural and revealed religion, there should be much difference in the method pursued. Theism may, indeed, be declared to be the universal faith of the race—a belief in the existence of God, somehow or other, necessarily arising in the human mind—but, in the effort to exhibit its valid proofs, the arguments have been made to rest on different bases, and to draw their force from opposite sources. They may all be included under two chief methods, one or the other of which has plainly characterized all the metaphysical exhibition of the theistic evidence. These methods have resulted from different psychological systems. They have, for some time, shown a tendency to stand more than ever apart from each other, each one claiming for itself almost exclusive validity. They may be marked, in general, as the *a priori* and the *a posteriori*, methods of proof. Whilst one class of writers have rested the proof of the existence of God wholly on the direct report of a necessary intuition, the other have recognized the validity of the conclusions of the logical faculty in this subject, and have

found the being and attributes of God declared in the arrangements and order of the physical cosmos.

The frequent issues of the press, on this subject, indicate an undiminished interest in it. The volumes named at the the head of this article, are but specimens of the numerous works which the discussion is producing. They present different aspects of the *a posteriori* evidence. In *Pater Mundi*, by Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., we are furnished with an earnest defense of Theism, on the principles of modern science. The discussion is pursued with great vigor, in a style full of energy, though sometimes overloaded with adjective and metaphor. His logic takes fire, and glows in the fervency of deep conviction and strong enthusiasm. The volume by Prof. Cooke makes a specialty of the evidence furnished in the advanced state of chemistry. This department has supplied rich material, and the author has wrought it up in clear and convincing exhibition. The work breathes throughout the calm and assured spirit which never doubts the victory of truth. It is a most valuable contribution to the theistic discussion, and well deserves the place that has, for some time, been accorded to it in our libraries. The same may be said of the *Typical Forms*, by Dr. M'Cosh. This work has vindicated a claim to permanent value, in the new material which it has brought to view, with the clear indication of the place it holds in the cosmical argument. It carries the proof back into the deepest and most universal features of the mighty system in the midst of which we stand, evidencing, not only the unity of nature's great Author, but unfolding the vastness and grandeur of the great archetypal thought, whose realization becomes expressive of God's certain existence.

These comparatively recent works, are all based on the same fundamental principle that shaped the well-known argument of Paley, in his Natural Theology—the fact of *final causes* in nature. We have brought them together for the purpose of showing that this method of the theistic argument has not been abandoned or superseded. It presents the gratifying fact, that as science is pushing on its victories

over the realm of matter, the new material discovered, and the new relations disclosed, fall into place as fresh elements of strength in the old proof. Whilst skepticism is eager to turn the results of scientific investigation to the support of its destructive errors, able minds are steadily throwing the developed facts into clearer and more triumphant vindication of the truths of religion. The foundations of the theistic proof are thus contiunally sunk deeper, and laid more broadly, on the immovable granite.

In view of the multiplication of works in which the ascent is made "from nature up to nature's God," and the prevalence of this method, despite the objections alleged against it by an opposing school of philosophic thought, it is proposed, in this article, to recur, briefly, to some aspects of past speculation on this subject, and note the elements of permanence, validity and value in the argument from final causes.

I. The *a priori* method, resting the evidence of the existence of God on the basis of direct intuition, has become the special manner of speculative transcendentalism. A close view of it will, indeed, satisfy us, that the argument, in this form, is not a purely *a priori* process, as it involves some elements of experience and inference; but this designation is sufficiently accurate to contradistinguish it from the general argument from design and adaptation. The method appears to be of mediæval origin. To the meditative mind of Anselm, the idea of God in the mind of man was accepted as itself the unanswerable evidence of the existence of God. The principle forced itself on Descartes, who presents it without any apparent knowledge of its earlier origin. It is found re-asserted in Leibnitz. Deemed unsatisfactory by Kant, it has been revived by Schelling and Hegel, and adopted by many metaphysicians in Germany and elsewhere. It assumes that the very idea in the mind, of the infinite and perfect, involves the existence of the Infinite and Perfect Being. This necessary and universal idea of a God, together with an intuitive *belief*, is taken as itself the absolute revelation of His being. The statement of it, in this aspect, is clearly

given by COUSIN: "The idea of God is a primitive idea; but whence does this idea come to you? Is it a creation of your imagination, an illusion, a chimera? You can imagine a gorgon, a centaur, to exist, and you can imagine them not to exist; but is it in your power, the finite and imperfect being given, to conceive or not to conceive the Infinite and Perfect? No; the one being given, the other is necessary. It is not, then, a chimera; it is a necessary product of your reason: therefore it is a legitimate product. Being a legitimate product, it must point to a reality. Else you make your reason dishonest and false."* COUSIN's form of statement results from his theory of correlative ideas. The finite and infinite, being correlative, are necessary forms of thought. From this he reaches the direct conclusion, "The single fact of the conception of God by reason, the idea alone of God implies the certainty and necessity of the existence of God."

It is but a modified aspect of this method, that is presented in the metaphysics of Schleiermacher. To save himself from the nihilistic conclusions of the Kantian and Fichtean philosophy, he called in the conviction of an essential faith, or 'God-consciousness,' in the human mind. The false view of the relativity of knowledge elaborated by Sir W. Hamilton, and carried into a wide ascendency by the vigor of his discussion and the greatness of his name, has increased the number of those who, denying the validity of all logical proof, depend upon this direct intuition. Reason, not reasoning, they assert, gives the conviction of the divine existence. Holding it to be an *ultimate datum* of consciousness, involved in the constitution of the mind, they maintain the being of God to be above proof, impossible to be either doubted or demonstrated, a direct cognition that must be accepted.

The supporters of the *a priori* method have been wont either to disparage, or to reject entirely the use of *a posteriori* proof. There seems to be, among them lately, an increased disposition to assert that the logical faculty can find no valid

---

*Hist. of Modern Philos. Vol. II. pp. 420—421.

argument whatever for the existence of God. Not intending to cast any doubt on the truth of the Divine existence, they, nevertheless, maintain the exclusive and sufficient reliability of this intuitive conviction, or report of the so-called 'God-sciousness' of the human mind. The teleologieal proof is discarded as not simply incompetent, but as unnecessary. We cannot regard this exclusive claim of *a priori* evidence as either philosophical or correct. Whatever may be admitted as real and true in the proof furnished by this method, it must be regarded as a false and groundless claim, when it is maintained that it *alone* has legitimate validity. It goes upon the baseless assumption, that the being of God has but a single evidence, and that from a single point of creation. Without doubt, the construction of a valid theistic argument, by natural theology, requires the use of *a priori* data, and intuitive truths. It is freely allowed, that the Creator has mirrored his being in the depths of the human soul. In his intellectual and spiritual personality, man is an image of God. Mind is the noblest part of creation open to our knowledge, and we may well look into its mysterious being, to see some proof of its Author's existence, some reflection of its Maker. Perhaps this may rise up among its necessary formal conceptions and convictions. But is there no other evidence than that which comes from this single point? Is it reasonable to believe, on the supposition of the existence of a Creator, that there is no other part of the vast system, in which He has revealed His being? Would we not rather expect that wherever His hand should touch and fashion and arrange, the proofs of that hand would be disclosed? Is it not philosophical, to suppose that, standing in the midst of a universe of divine handi-work, the being of its Maker, if there be, indeed, a personal Author, would shine out upon us wherever we should look? Is it reasonable to suppose that this first and greatest of all truths should be left with a single and incomprehensible evidence? What if any one should say, "I have no such necessary intuition?" Is there then no other evidence—no other argument—to lift the horrors of

atheism from the helpless soul? Whilst admitting, therefore, the *a priori* as *one* method of proof, of some value, it must be regarded as the merest dogmatism of one-sided speculation, to make it the *only* proof. Over against all exclusive claims, we believe the statement of Leibnitz will vindicate itself as correct; "Almost all the means which have been employed to prove the existence of God are good, and are capable of serving their end, if only perfected."

II. The other great method, basing the conclusion of the existence of God on the evidence of design and adaptation in nature, is of earliest origin and widest prevalence. Though denominated *a posterior*, it proceeds upon some *a priori* data, and involves some primary convictions in completing its conclusions. It is essentially an inductive process, and so rests the validity of its conclusions on scientific principles. Instead of looking inwardly, into the depths of consciousness to see what is printed there, it looks out on the vast world around, and from the order, beauty, adaptation and design, that shine forth wherever we turn, it concludes the existence of an intelligent Author of all. Unquestionably, and as a matter of fact, there is something in nature which leads to belief in God. By virtue of the necessary belief in causality, the mind rises from a view of the structure of the world to a conviction of the existence of a Maker of it. Effects, everywhere so clearly marked with wisdom, intelligence and power, demands an adequate cause. The existence and perfection of the one involve and prove the existence and perfection of the other. Mind is the only absolute cause of effects—intelligence the only correlate and explanation of order. The contrivance, and adapted structure, all around and within us, do not proceed from an absolute origin and potency in themselves, or the blind action of matter; and by force of a necessary judgment of the logical faculty, they are referred to an intelligent contriver and Maker.

The value of this proof, known as that from final causes, is the point to which our attention is specially called at the present time. The sensational school of philosophy, denying

all intuitions, can, of course, allow no validity to the proof on *a priori* data, and the speculative school, standing over against this manifest extreme, have waged a war of destructive criticism against the claims of the *a posteriori* argument. Against all narrow limitation of the theistic proof we are disposed, however, to quote the view of the brilliant Cousin, "These *two* proofs are excellent, I repeat; and instead of choosing between them, it is necessary, like the human mind, to accept and employ them both. In fact, they so little exclude each other, that each of them contains somewhat of the other."* The internal and the external, the subjective and the objective, have been correlated to each other in the constitution of man's being and environment, and the data of both are to be united, to furnish the complete form and force of evidence.

1. The prevalence of the method of proof from final causes, in the most ancient times, must not be overlooked in forming a just estimate of its value. It appears among the earliest efforts to give formal statement of the valid philosophical grounds of the prevalent conviction of the divine existence. Among the ancient theists, the evidences of order, system and harmony, were fondly dwelt upon as overthrowing the dreaded phantoms of chance and fate. The facts of design and adaptation in nature, seem to have been so clear and self-revealing, as to enforce a general recognition. The fundamental principle of all the ancient Greek philosophy was, that *beneath the fleeting forms and successive changes of the universe there is some permanent principle of unity.* PYTHAGORAS, basing his speculations on the idea of numbers, fixed attention on the harmony which pervades the material world, and represented that harmony as a manifestation of the intelligence and unity of its eternal principle. SOCRATES, in order to make valid his spontaneous faith in God, and to meet the atheistic notions that appeared in his day, put the knowledge of His existence upon a logical basis, and appealed to the or-

*Hist. Mod. Philos. II. p. 422.

der and arrangement in nature as testimony to His being. He taught that men should see God in his works, and offer worship and service.* In reading his conversation with Aristodemus, we are made to feel that he anticipated all modern writers on Natural Theology in this very argument from special ends and final causes.† Many of the instances of design and contrivance, collected into such a grand museum of illustration by the investigations and science of modern times, found in the human organism and the universe around, were already adduced by him, as assuring the conclusion that "man must be the master-piece of some great Artificer," and this stupendous universe could not have been "produced by chance, but by intelligence." It is not at all surprising, considering the character of his philosophy, that EPICURUS, or his poetical commentator, LUCRETIUS should have discarded the whole doctrine of design, or final causes, inasmuch as his denial of the existence of God left no place for the idea of design, or intelligent arrangement, in the works of nature. To the mind of CICERO, this method was familiar, and in his discussion of the Nature of the Gods, he makes different speakers employ it, in some cases, with great fulness and beauty of illustration.‡ From the time of Cicero down to the present, it has been by far the most common way of stating the theistic proof. Its literature has been steadily increasing. It is found in the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages. Its progress has been very marked. Through such discussions as of Ray, and Durham, and Paley, the Bridgewater Treatises, of Sir Chas. Bell, of Chalmers and Whewell, and especially the Burnett prize Essays, by Thompson, Tullock and Orr, Dove's Logic of the Christian Faith, and the Treatises of Buchanan on Faith in God, and Modern Atheism, the evidences from nature have been more and more thoroughly explored, and the current caused to flow on in still deeper and broader channel. Constantly assailed by ad-

*Xen, Mem. IV. 3 : 13. †Xen. Mem. I. 4.
‡De Nat. Deorum Lib. II.

verse speculation, and declared, sometimes, by its opposers, to be "cut up by the roots," it has given no sign of feebleness, but holds its place, unharmed, in the deepest confidence of the best and strongest philosophy and theology of our age. Attacks have only served to point out the earlier defects of its formal statement, and cause the argument to be thrown into more logical accuracy and compact strength. It manifests the spontaneity, vigor and permanence of real truth.

2. The usefulness of the argument from design must not be overlooked. For two thousand years it has been giving anchorage to human faith in the grand truth of the existence of God. Without doubt, it has, far more than any other sort of evidence, impressed the minds of men with His being and perfections. Were the argument invalid, as alleged, it would seem that it should hardly result in such happy fruits, or appear in such blessed power. The barrenness, or evil, resulting from the employment of false reasoning in support of truth, has not been realized in this connection, and the supposed falseness has thus been happily disproved.

Some of those with whom it has been the fashion to speak disparagingly of the doctrine of final causes, have been wont to appeal to the authority of Bacon, as adverse to its value. It is alike unfair to the truth, and unjust to the real views of this father of modern inductive science, to attribute any such opinion to him, or to use his great name to overthrow an argument to which he clung with the greatest confidence. Bacon has been most falsely interpreted in reference to his attitude toward this method. His oracular utterance, "The search after *final causes* is barren, and, like a consecrated virgin, brings forth nothing,"* has been supposed to deny entirely the usefulness of such inquiries. There is double proof, however, that Bacon referred, *not* to the use of the doctrine in relation to *theology*, but only to its employment in the investigations of *physical science*. The first is the fact, that in the very passage containing this famous aphorism, he care-

*"Causarum finalium inquisitio sterilis est, et tanquam Virgo Deo consecrata, nihil parit."

fully defines this meaning, and asserts his reference to *physics.* He admits that, "Final causes may be founded in truth, and in a metaphysical view extremely worthy of attention;" but asserts that "when they invade and overrun the province of physics," they "operate as a powerful obstacle to the progress of inductive science." The second is, that he has accepted the argument as valid for his own belief in God—"I had rather believe all the fables in the Legends, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind; and, therefore, God never wrought miracles to convince atheism, because His ordinary works convince it. It is true, that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity."* A more striking expression of the effectiveness and usefulness of the study of final causes could hardly be found.

This mode of argument can be appreciated, and its force is felt, by all classes of men. It has a special adaptation to the masses. To these, the abstruse speculations of *a priori* philosophies, have no meaning. The attempt to satisfy their minds, by rational psychologies, is sheer mockery. The question might well be raised, Has God made His existence incapable of legitimate evidence to all but a select few, whose minds have been disciplined in forms of abstruse metaphysics? May we not rather suppose that His eternal power and Godhead would be caused to shine out in a light so plain as to lighten every man that cometh into the world, and thus leave all without excuse? But *every* man is capable of the conviction carried by this method to the mind. No familiarity with the heights and depths of science is necessary. No severe discipline of the mental faculties is needed. The "common mind" looks out on nature, all filled with order, system, adaptation, bright with evidences of wisdom and goodness,

*Essay on Atheism.

and feels at once, and increasingly, the glowing assurance that this "universal frame" must have come from the hand of an almighty Maker. He needs no severe logic—needs pass through no labyrinthine speculations. The conclusion is direct—this world of countless wonders—this universe of mighty systems—must hang on the arm of a God. Is he not right? Thus, the common intelligence, combined with the moral perceptions and primary judgments of causality, leads men generally to faith in the divine existence. No other method of proof has been as grandly useful as this. And whilst it has satisfied the minds of the millions, it is suited to the demands of the most vigorous and philosophical intellects. The argument, being laid in essentially valid principles, though sometimes wanting in conformity to logical and conclusive forms, is only compacted into grander strength and more convincing power, as the realm of nature and mind is more broadly and thoroughly explored. The farther one goes into the glorious realm of nature, the richer become the materials of the argument from design, the more irrefragable the evidence of the hand of an intelligent and mighty Author of the world. And when we see how it has anchored the theistic convictions of such minds as Bacon and Boyle, Newton and Butler, and Tillotson and Paley, the Bridgewater Authors, and Chalmers and Whewell, we must feel assured, that while this argument is so convincing to the common mind, it is not less useful to the most royal thinkers in the kingdom of science.

3. The varied statement of the general argnment, to exhibit its substance in valid logical form, is an interesting indication of its many-sided strength. In the popular presentation of it by Paley and other writers, syllogistic dialectics have been neglected. When assailed by the subtle speculations of sceptical philosophies, its essence has been thrown, by its friends, into different forms, to show its real validity.

Among the earliest of these syllogistic forms, is that given by Dr. Reid:

"Design and intelligence in the cause may, with certainty, be inferred from marks or signs of it in the effect:

There are, in fact, the clearest marks of design and wisdom in the works of nature:

Therefore, the works of nature are the effects of a wise and intelligent cause."*

Exception has been taken to this form of statement, that, in passing over from the major to the minor proposition, it tacitly carries over to the "works of nature," the conclusion suggested by the term "effect," while yet this is the very thing to be proved—viz., that the world is an effect. This is the criticism of Dr. Crombie, in his work on Natural Theology. The atheism of the Positive Philosophy assails both the propositions, and denies alike that order and arrangement prove design, and that the works of nature afford any valid evidence of design. But whilst Reid's statement of it is, unquestionably, not the most happy, it will be able steadily to withstand the untenable position of Positivism.

The form into which it has been cast by Archbishop Whately, is more precise and compact:

"Whatever exhibits marks of design had an intelligent author.

The world exhibits marks of design.

Therefore, the world had an intelligent author."

The rational mind, it seems to us, cannot but admit that real adjustments to a given object—the clear and distinct adaptation of means to ends—prove a designing intelligence. It is, indeed, a self-evident proposition. If, however, on the authority of the nescience Philosophy, it should be claimed that our only warrant for this seeming self-evidence, is the absence of *experience* of any other cause for these adaptations than mind, the objection is such that, if admitted as valid, it at once sweeps away all primary and fundamental truths from our philosophy. But the Philosophy that furnishes the objection, is so absolutely self-destructive—starting from premises and reaching conclusions, neither of which can be verified—that it cannot be recognized as capable of presenting any valid objection. Certain it is, that, constituted as

---

*See Essay VI. Chap. VI.

we are, we can conceive of no other cause than mind for these adaptations of means to ends, and the force of our mental laws leaves it as the only explanation, to us, of these arrangements.

Not much different is the syllogistic form preferred by Prof. Tulloch, viz.:

"Order universally proves Mind.
The works of Nature discover Order.
Therefore, the works of Nature prove Mind."*

Prof. Tulloch was led to this, in order to obviate the need of proving the world to be an "effect," involved in the formal statement of Reid. And, as the proposition, that "the works of nature discover order," is confessedly so overwhelmingly sustained, he devotes his special attention to the proof of the major premise. In doing so, he wisely and successfully shows that the common conviction that "Order universally proves Mind," is not a conviction of experience or induction, but a necessary datum of human thought. It thus becomes, not a contingent, but a necessary truth, which can be "set aside only by denying the veracity of our rational being altogether, and so destroying the foundations of all science and philosophy." But it seems to us, that while the author is correct, and touches down on solid rock, in making this a primary truth of the Reason, the *form* in which he puts the premise is less suited to show this than that of Whately. "Order" does not so manifestly and directly show Mind, as does "Whatever exhibits marks of design." For instance, the "order" of basaltic pillars, almost rivaling the regularity of human architecture, is very apparent, but it is not equivalent to *adaptation*, or *design*, and does not so plainly reveal a designing intelligence. Unquestionably, however, Prof. Tulloch must employ the term "order" as almost a synonym for adaptations to actual ends.

Dr. W. Flemming, of the University of Glasgow, connecting the supposed invalidity of the argument with defective or inaccurate statements of it, resolves the major premise in-

---

*Theism, Prize Essay, p. 14.

to two parts: 1. "The contemplation of things independent of one another uniting to accomplish an end, suggests or develops the idea of order and fitness." 2. "The idea of order or fitness between independent things, implies an intelligent cause." He believes that "it is not so much the correspondence of parts in a harmonious whole, as the independence of the parts so harmonizing, which proves the exercise of choice and intelligence." This idea of the *independence* of the agencies in concurrent relation, is, doubtless, an important element. And, in view of it, he states the reasoning in full, thus:

"Order, or fitness, between independent things, implies an intelligent or designing cause.

There are examples of such order, or fitness, in the production and phenomena of nature.

Therefore, these productions and phenomena have an intelligent cause."*

The form of it thus given, cannot, however, on the whole, be regarded as the most forcible or happy.

But while some of these and other forms, into which the argument has been cast, are better than others, omitting less or what rightly belongs to it, and holding the links of the premises and conclusion in more evidential relation, the solid substance of them, it seems to us, must be regarded as much the same in all, and essentially valid. Underneath them all, is a real proof that refuses to disappear by reason of defective or partial statement. The value of a true principle of evidence is felt to be in it, through all verbal changes in the reduction to syllogistic expression. The great fact of order and adaption in nature, like a crystal of many sides, reflects its light, from whatever point it is looked upon. Through all changes of the argument, and after every doubtful feature is taken away, it is not reduced to nothing.

4. The unsupported character of the speculations from which the objections have come, must be noticed. Until the theories from which the difficulties arise are verified into ac-

*Moral Science, London 1867, p. 337.

tual knowledge, or settled truth, they cannot be regarded as rightly overthrowing any previously accepted view. It is from the speculations of philosophy and science, however, that the proof from final causes has been subjected to its severest assaults. This is still the source from which it is assailed. We believe, however, that it has come thus far safely through the ordeal. Of the manifold attacks made upon it, it does not appear that any one has overthrown its foundations, or shown it fallacious. They have indeed, shown defects and inaccuracies in its incidental forms, but not in its essential substance. And it will be found, on any fair examination, that this theistic proof stands, to-day, on a stronger and better tried basis, and more invincible principles, than any of the data or inferences of philosophy in conflict with it.

The speculations of Kant, and other German metaphysicians, have been regarded by some as having actually removed the foundations from this method of argument. In determining the relations between the objective and subjective, Kant has reached the conclusion that our knowledge of external things extends only to the fact that *they are*, and all beyond is purely subjective. The phenomena are modified by the contemplating mind, which imposes its own forms upon the world. What appears in matter as its qualities and relations, are but a reflection of the laws of our own understanding. Thus, he makes Time, Space, and Causation, mere forms of the mind, wholly subjective, but necessarily given in thinking. The laws of the subjective world are projected upon the objective. In this way, he accounts for the relation of cause and effect, and the order of the universe. They are not in the universe itself, but in the mind, and, as the necessary forms or categories under which the mind knows things, they are transferred to the external world. In this system, the objective harmonies and adaptations of nature must necessarily disappear. They are the mind's shadows lying on nature. Fichte, following out the Kantian doctrine to its logical conclusion, carried it into absolute idealism. Accepting it, that the mind was capable of creating the relations of the world, he concluded that it was capable of form-

ing the world itself, and made the external universe, with all its laws, order and harmonies, but a product, or thought, of the mind. Now, on these theories, of course, no valid argument for the existence of God can be based on the appearance of order, design, or cause and effect in nature. These are swept away from the outer world. Many have seemed ready to admit that this theory is decisive, and that it effectually overthrows, the common theistic proof from nature. But it is enough to say that this speculative position has never been established as undoubted philosophical truth. On the contrary, the best philosophy rejects it as utterly unsustained and false. We have as valid evidence of the existence of the external world, as of the internal. And we have no more proof that the mind creates the qualities and relations of external things than the things themselves—or, that it makes the relations that it supposes itself only to perceive and know. It is a most gratuitous assumption. And the philosophy which confounds the *knowledge* of things and relations, with *creation* of them, undermines its own foundations. Moreover, if it be by some necessary form of the understanding that final cause is impressed on things, how is it that we do not see the final cause in every thing? Why does it appear in some occurrences and not in others? Must it not be, because it is an objective reality, with various degrees of evidence disclosing it to the mental perception? And, further, what would Science have to say to this theory which destroys, either nature itself, or its relations, properties and laws? Science regards itself as having, in its realm, the most solid and indubitable realities of existence—perhaps the only realities about which we can have any sure and reliable knowledge. If there is anything at all that Science holds and treats as real, it is matter and its properties, relations, and laws—professing to know the properties and laws rather than the substances. Will Science submit, to have all its data at once theorized out of actual existence? Will it accept the declaration, that all the properties, relations, harmonies, and laws of the great universe, stretching out in measureless distances and wonderful

arrangements on every side, are but the products of its own thinking, and that in all its laborious and severe objective investigations, it is but playing with the subjective forms of mind? Surely the grand facts of nature, organization, arrangement, adaptation to ends, that constitute the material of this theistic argument, will not disappear at the bidding of such a theory.

More decisively, perhaps, than any other, the *nescience Philosophy*, developed from French Positivism and the older teaching of Hume, has assumed principles and reached conclusions, that array it against the common methods and arguments of Natural Theology. But its destructive analysis has become self-annihilative. Its representatives make all our knowledge so entirely phenomenal and relative, as to cut us off altogether from the attainment of absolute, or real truth. *A priori*, or necessary truth, is denied. Our primary convictions and intuitions are treated as unreliable. The law of causation is not a necessary truth, but only a deduction from experience. The supposed law, that every event must have a cause, is only the unwarranted conclusion that results from our want of experience of events without a cause. All that is involved in the necessary mental conviction of causation, is our incapacity to transcend experience. Our irresistible tendency to refer effects to causes, together with our inability to think of an event as without a cause, is simply that our thinking is shut up within the limits of our uniform experience. The law of causation ceases, thus, to be an expression of a necessary and universal truth. This primary intuition, and others, are asserted to have no objective value; and the validity we have been accustomed to attribute to them as pointing to indubitable and necessary verities in the universe, is held as delusive. With the force of vigorous mind and great learning, Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and others, are leveling their efforts against the accepted principles underlying Natural Theology and Christian truth; and were we obliged to accept their speculations as final philosophy, and their conclusions as truly valid, we would see very little fundamental truth of any sort left, and the domain of religion

apparently swept of all its grand realities. Not only would all the evidences for the existence of God disappear, but we would be excluded from the possibility of any knowedge of Him. Should we be left to worship at all, it would have to be before the *Unknown* and *Unknowable.* "By continually seeking to know," says Mr. Spencer, "and being continually thrown back with a deepened conviction of the impossibility of knowing, we may keep alive the consciousness that it is alike our highest wisdom and our highest duty to regard that through which all things exist as The Unknowable."* This is not the place to repeat the refutation of these positions—positions which lead to complete philosophical, as well as religious, skepticism—and to show how sound Philosophy has been, and is, rejecting and casting them off. It is enough to say that this Positive Philosophy, by its fundamental negatives, destroys its own foundations and loses all valid force. It is a system of absolute nescience—negatives all reliable knowledge, and thus negatives its own conclusions. These conclusions, therefore, cannot stand as positive truth for the overthrow of any different teaching.

The *Natural Sciences*, in their varied departments, have been the source of steadily increasing strength to the entire cosmological proof. Opening out to our view the vast realm of nature, and revealing its immensity, order, and harmony, all pervaded by the clearest adjustment of its myriad parts to each other and to a common end, the progress of Science becomes a necessary unrolling of the scroll of theistic evidence. Everywhere, from the deep records in the rocks, from the unnumbered orbs that move in order through the sky. and all around through the mighty realm of nature, it gathers its accumulating testimony. True Science is necessarily theistic. It is not surprising that skepticism has always shown an eagerness, either to silence its testimony, or pervert it into false-witness against both natural and revealed religion. So strongly has this been manifested, that a real antagonism has sometimes been thought to exist between science and reli-

---

**First Principles*, by Herbert Spencer, p. 113.

gion. Some friends of religion have feared and opposed the progress of science. Science, in turn, as if accepting the notion that it had a real foe in religion, has occasionally treated it with an unnatural opposition. Men have been ready to put asunder what should be sacredly joined together. Without doubt, the two directions of scientific activity which have been regarded as offering most grounds for fear in reference to theistic and Christian truth, are in the varied Theories of Development, and the doctrine of Protoplasm, as furnishing a material basis of life. Mr. Darwin and Mr. Huxley are the representatives of tendencies in science felt to be most boldly and truly antagonistic to religion. The forces of skepticism are rallying on the ground offered in these alleged scientific explanations of the world and of life. But however hostile to Christian theism may be the animus of much of this scientific speculation, it has not, as yet, established any results to overthrow it. So far as its alleged conclusions are in actual conflict with this, or any other, theistic proof, they are, to say the least, unsustained. We are not, by any means, to accept as science, every statement and result put forth in its name. Nothing is better known, than that Science is continually leaving behind its own theories, and superseding its own conclusions. The line of its real progress is marked with the graves of thousands of its dead theories and discarded decisions. Very little, indeed, is saved from the great mass of its work, to stand as undoubted and permanent truth. Never was the process of superseding supposed scientific results more marked than in our own day. This fact ought to abate some of the dogmatism with which its unproved inferences are sometimes asserted. Not a single feature or claim of science, now offering points of real antagonism to the evidence of the divine existence from final causes, can be regarded as established, scientific men themselves being, as they probably should be, the judges. But were the entire Development Theory, from the nebular hypothesis of Laplace to the evolution scheme of Darwin, verified as true cosmogony and science, it would not even then necessarily destroy the evidences of design. It would require the same infinite in-

telligence to create a universe out of nebular matter and primordial conditions, by the long process of development, as by direct exercise of creative power. A development theory might be held, in harmony with a certain kind of theism. The creative purpose and plan would stand as the primal cause and determination of the development itself. The germinal matter and force could be regarded as charged, from the first, with all that appears in the result. The facts of design, order, relation of means to ends, would be left to us, as having been stamped, as laws of structure, organization and life, on the primal matter from which the universe has been evolved. "Before the first organic cell could exist, and before Mr. Darwin's principle of natural selection could begin that work of unnumbered ages which was to end in developing a perfect man, nay, even before the solid globe itself could be condensed from Laplace's nebula, the chemical elements must have been created, and endowed with those properties by which alone the existence of that cell is rendered possible."

But though a development theory is not necessarily, and under all forms, atheistic, it is unquestionable that this method of interpreting the genesis of nature and man is meant, by many, to cover a denial of the existence of an intelligent, personal Creator. The evolution is referred only to primal laws and forces. It starts from no intelligent cause. And so the order and adaptations of nature, supposed to prove design, are interpreted as the result of nothing but blind material development. But the verdict of scientific men themselves is, that the theory has not been proved. It has no right, as yet, to be regarded as science. It manifestly goes upon the weak assumption, that there is an inconsistency between free creative acts and the regularity of gradation and sequence observed in the operations of nature. Immediate divine working is apprehended as necessarily arbitrary, and incapable of moving on in the unity and successsions of the mighty scheme. "The fundamental character of all theological philosophy," says Mr. Lewes, "is to *conceive phenomena as subjected to Supernatural Volition*, and, consequently, as eminently

and *irregularly variable.*"* The continuity of the plan in nature, and the gradations of organic life from the lowest to the highest, are regarded as too orderly and unbroken, to have been accomplished by God in a system of direct and immediate working. Scarcely anything more absurd could be imagined, than such a notion of irregularity, as applied to the Divine volition. The only valid presumption would be just the opposite. Infinite Reason and infinite Wisdom, directing creative power, must mean perfect order and self-consistency in all the measureless plan. The actual and beautiful order of nature, must be regarded as the true and appropriate expression of the agency of a Divine Will. And the eye is not to be closed to the fact, that the transitions from lower to higher forms of organization and life, is far more unaccountable on the theory of a single, blind, persistent developing force, than by the free energy of a personal Creator. "Just think of it. A mist of blind elements blindly shaping itself, not only into an infinity of useful and admirable objects—and such only—like plants and animals, but into intelligent and moral beings; into statesmen, philosophers, and saints; into Napoleons, Miltons, Newtons, Howards; in fine, into such books as the Principia or Paradise Lost." But the truth is, that it is only an hypothesis, so unsupported by true principles and fair inductions, so gratuitous in its assumptions and illogical in its processes, so plainly as yet but an elaborate fiction, that it becomes a wrong upon science to call it by its name.

The same is true of the conclusions put forth in connection with the famous doctrine of protoplasm, in which mind is represented as a mere manifestation of organization, and intelligence itself a mere phenomenon of matter. A recent examination of Huxley's doctrine, by J. Hutchison Stirling, LL. D. and F. R. S., has shown that Mr. Huxley's alleged scientific facts are unsustained, and, indeed, contradicted, by the most advanced recent results reached by the great German physiologists, Rindfleisch, Kühne, Stricker, &c., and that

*Compte's Philosophy of the Sciences, by G. H. Lewes, p. 102.

his conclusions are unwarranted and gratuitous. A passage in Mr. Stirling's paper, touching the relation of Huxley's doctrine to the argument from final causes, is so apposite as to justify quotation. After showing that protoplasm furnishes no account at all of *life*, or vital organization, he declares it utterly incompetent to account for the objective *design* everywhere apparent in organization: "In the smallest, lowest protoplasm cell, then, we have this rational unity of a complement of individuals that are only for the whole, and exist in the whole. This is an idea, therefore; this is design: the organized concert of many to a single common purpose. The rudest savage that should, as in Paley's illustration, find a watch, and should observe the various contrivances all controlled by the single end in view, would be obliged to acknowledge—though in his own way—that what he had before him was no mere physical, no mere molecular product. So in protoplasm: even from the first, but, quite undeniably, in the completed organization at least, which alone it was there to produce; for a single idea has been its one manifestation throughout. And in what machinery does it not at length issue? Was it molecular powers that invented a respiration—that perforated the posterior ear to give a balance of air—that compensated the *fenestra ovalis* by a *fenestra rotunda*—that placed in the auricular sacs those *otolithes*, those express stones for hearing? Such machinery! The *chordæ tendineæ* are to the valves of the heart exactly adjusted check-strings; and the contractile *columnæ carneæ* are set in, under contraction and expansion, to equalize the length to their office. Membranes, rods, and liquids—it required the express experiment of man to make good the fact that the inventor of the ear had availed himself of the most perfect apparatus possible for his purpose. And are we to conceive such machinery, such apparatus, such contrivances, merely molecular? Are molecules adequate to such things—molecules in their blind passivity, and dead, dull insensibility?"*

A candid examination must satisfy any one that the doc-

*As regards Protoplasm, p. 47.

trine of final causes has not been shaken or set aside, by the conclusions of Science. It stands, firm and impregnable as ever, in the midst of its established truths, supported by all, and in conflict with none. And as the fact of design, which beams out so clearly in the structure of complex organisms, is found adhering to the minutest divisions to which analysis can reduce them, science seems to have no possible power to eliminate it. The parts of nature show design, not only in their organization and relations, but in the very atoms, in which chemistry has pursued its keenest search. It persists in the properties of the chemical elements, and beyond these, science, it would seem, cannot go.

5. The two principal objections, urged strongly some years ago, against the validity of the argument from final causes—the impossibility of proving either Personality, or the Infinite, from nature—are still, sometimes, presented. And it must be admitted that they have presented points of real difficulty. But the recent discussions, it seem to us, have furnished satisfactory answers, and relieved the argument from the weight of the objections. A short notice of them seems to be required.

Our inability to deduce, legitimately, a free, intelligent Personality, from mere matter in organization, has been strongly pressed. The fact is conceded. We search in vain for it, in material forms and mechanical adaptations. In these we can discover only effects, conditioned in material causes, each one arising out of the preceding, in a chain running back indefinitely. How can we stop this "regressus" through merely conditioning causes, and leap, in conclusion, from this linked necessity, to free creative Personality? On the principle, that the conclusion must not transcend the contents of the premises, mechanism cannot give us personality. But the difficulty is more formidable in appearance than in reality. It evidently arises, mainly, from a failure to discriminate between the acts of the discursive faculty and those of reason. An analysis of the elements of the process, in the argument, will show how the difficulty disappears. 1. The matter, in nature, which shows order and mechanism,

shows us more than order and mechanism—*intent*, or *design*. This directs our intuition to the fact of intelligence. 2. Whilst it is admitted that we cannot, in the exercise of the discursive faculty, which acts only in judgments on what has been given it, get the idea of personality, from external nature, it is a primary datum of our *reason*, which we bring with us, and cannot but bring with us, to the argument. It does not come from the external phenomena, but is a prior and necessary content of the mind, with which we come to the explanation of the phenomena. Having the idea of personality, as we must, in our essential consciousness, it is not a matter of choice, whether we will use it or not, in the explanation of the marks of design which meet us everywhere in nature. Reason demands personality for the intelligent agency. It refuses to permit these phenomena to rest in themselves, or in any conditioned and unintelligent antecedents. Those who object to the argument from special ends and adaptations, on the ground that these adjustments in nature cannot yield us personality, seem to imagine that we must not use *in* the argument anything that is not given *by* it, as if the point were, not whether we can form a valid argument *with* the idea of personality, but whether we can do so *without* it; or, as if the discursive faculty, wholly divorced from the reason and its data, must supply, and do, everything. Whilst the logical faculty may not leap out of the material conditions, and furnish the interpreting personality, the reason furnishes it, and finds, in the adaptations of nature, a designing Intelligence, in which the idea of personality is met and satisfied. The recognition of final causes becomes, thus, in the fact itself, and by necessity, the recognition of a free Personality above nature.

Undoubtedly, the simple cosmological argument, exclusive of design—the argument from *efficient* causation alone—would fall short, in this respect. This rests solely upon the contingent character of nature. For its beginning and changes, there must be a cause, as an event or occurrence without a cause, is inconceivable. The principle of causation demands

a first cause, or one that is not, at the same time, an effect. "An eternal series is an absurd hypothesis, since it would be a series of effects without a cause." Eliminate the element of time, which is not a cause, and a series, just as truly as a single event, demands a cause. We are, thus, necessarily, conducted to belief in a cause that is absolute and independent. But, in this mode, we reach no proof of the personality of this first cause. It requires, yet, the inclusion of the fact of design, of intelligent arrangement to definite uses, in nature. This identifies the cause with Mind. In the union, then, of efficient cause with final causes, reason finds intelligence, and, necessarily connecting it with the primal cause, reaches a free Personality.

The second objection—the impossibility of deducing the Infinite from the finite—involves a graver difficulty in this mode of proof. Viewing God as the Infinite, or the Absolute, it must be admitted that induction can never demonstrate His existence. "The creation of the universe," we are reminded, "is only a finite manifestation of power, and from that we can never infer the Infinite. Every such argument is incomplete, as embracing more in the conclusion than is involved in the premises. We can no more infer the infinite or transcendent Being, from the exhibition of an indefinitely great universe, than we can rise to Eternity by an indefinite addition of times, or to Immensity, by an accumulation of finite spaces. Inductive generalization cannot draw from finite data more than they contain." Unquestionably, there is force in this. It has been one of the standing exceptions to the argument of Paley. But after all, the objection fails of its object, and leaves the value of the argument untouched. A few considerations will make this evident.

In the *first* place, the argument is not, directly, and in form, an argument for the *Infinite*. If it were, it would, necessarily, be incompetent. To say, therefore, that it does not prove the existence of the Infinite, is only to say that it does not prove what it was never properly intended to prove. The inquiry is, directly, after a Maker, or first Cause, of this wonderful world. The question toward the solution of which

it is aiming, does not concern, primarily, the *character* of God, or any of His attributes, beyond His intelligence and personality—not whether He is holy, or infinite, not the *qualis*, but the *esse*, the existence of a Maker. Whether infinite or not, is left to other evidence than final causes.

Secondly, In reaching an intelligent Creator of nature, it proceeds upon one of the most inevitable, and demonstrably valid principles that the human mind can have or use—the primary law of *causality*. It rests not on a contingent or inferential truth, but upon an *a priori* judgment, than which nothing can be more impregnable. The theory of the eternity of the world, in its present forms and organizations of matter, is so fully contradicted by science, as to be irrecoverably overthrown. And if the phenomena of nature are effects, they demand, under the necessary law of causality, the recognition of a Cause. In connection with the fact of design, they demand an intelligent and personal Cause.

Thirdly, In requiring a cause adequate to the effects, the argument reaches, for the mighty system of nature, if not an *infinite* personal Creator, yet a Being *transcendently* and *inconceivably great*. The intuition insists, not only on a Cause, but one competent for each and every effect, found in all the vast range of beautiful co-ordinations and complex adjustments in nature, from the microscopic organisms of earth, to the formation of the mightiest worlds in distant space. Now, under the disclosures of science, opening to view the vastness and riches of the universe, we are furnished with a revelation of something of the greatness of the Being in whom this universe finds its Author and support. And when our minds are filled with the greatness of nature—when we grasp, in thought, the magnitude of the earth, with its mighty continents and roaring oceans, a grand sphere of twenty-five thousand miles in circumference, peopled with a thousand million human beings, and inferior grades of life in innumerable forms, covered all around with the most elaborate and harmonious adjustments and finely balanced relations, crowded with wonders of power and wisdom and contrivance, all set together in most exquisite adaptations, alike in parts of the

greatest magnitude, and in the minutest forms into which the microscope can carry our search—when we look out on the sun in the heavens, and count its retinue of worlds which, along with our earth, move about it in their mighty orbits—when we gaze on the nightly sky, and find a thousand suns similarly attended—when we look through the telescope, and discover millions more—when system is seen to rise upon system, as space stretches outward, and group shines behind group, as the vision is helped onward still towards the frontiers of the universe—when the number of mighty worlds reaches beyond all computation, and the spaces through which they move, in unbroken unison and singing harmony, in their immeasurable orbits, stretch into overpowering amplitudes—when the imagination veils its face, in awe, in the presence of these ineffable magnitudes and distances and forces—then it is, that we begin to see how great a personal Creator we have reached in this proof from nature. Nature itself, in an undoubted unity, has become well nigh infinite. If the evidence falls short of being a proof of the Infinite, in the strict sense of the term, we have, nevertheless, found, in the argument, the great Author of the universe, our Maker, with practically almighty power and unlimited wisdom, the ground of all this frame of nature. And, in all this, the argument is invincible. This is, perhaps, all that this argument, as usually stated, legitimately yields. But if so, is it not, practically, enough? Shall it be declared invalid, and incapable of legitimate conclusion in the theistic inquiry, because it does not reach, if indeed it does not, beyond the fact of the existence of the great Author of this universe? Should we be told, in this day, that it is only the proof of a demiurge, we might safely leave the objector to the rebuke of his own encounter with the aggregate of Gnostic or Manichæan nonsense and absurdity, upon which he would cast himself.

But, *fourthly*, the argument has in it the elements of a valid conclusion to the Infinite and Absolute. At least, it has laid the invincible basis, on which the evidence completes itself through necessary intuitions and convictions of reason.

It must be conceded, indeed, that in Paley, and some other writers, a link is wanting for this final conclusion. They have assumed, but have not given, formal proof of the infinite for the Creator. Nor does it seem to be really necessary. For, unless the mind be held back, and disabled by the bewilderment of delusive speculations, *a priori* and necessary judgments at once clothe the God on whom all finite and dependent nature rests, with the attributes of infinity and absoluteness. All through the argument, the phenomena and adaptations of nature are held to be *finite* and *dependent*, and so, incapable alike of self-origination and self-support. And by the force of a necessary conviction, than which our minds can have nothing stronger, or more valid, this system of finite and dependent things must repose back on the bosom of the Infinite and the Absolute. Every event, and every finite being, is necessarily viewed as dependent, and independence is the correlative of dependence, and demanded by it. We may try our mental operations, and it will be found, that every finite event and being, depends on, and practically reveals, the infinite and absolute Power. The human mind is, necessarily, dissatisfied with merely caused or dependent causes, as not *exhausting* being, and refuses to rest, until it reaches the absolutely independent. In this way, as every portion of time seems to lose itself in Eternity, so every finite being calls for the Infinite Being in necessary and mysterious correlation with it. So that this finite and dependent universe, whose Creator is revealed in this method of evidence, demands, for Him, the attributes of infinity and independence. And what is to be specially noted, as beyond all doubt, we think, in this connection, is, that all this is involved in the *primary and necessary judgment of causality.* The law of causation, fully comprehended, includes not only that every separate event must have a cause, but that the *aggregate* of dependent being must have an Absolute Cause. It is only in this way, that the judgment of causality attains its full *comprehension.* Limited and dependent causes do not exhaust its demand. It reaches beyond all these, and claims, for their existence, a Cause that is not dependent. And thus the uni-

verse, that rests, according to the proof already given, on a personal Maker, rests on Him only, as the absolute and infinite God.

We are obliged, therefore, to regard the argument from final causes as essentially valid, notwithstanding all the hard things that have been said against it. When rightly understood, as grounded on, and completed in, the necessary intuitions of reason, this old evidence, unfolded and relied upon, in the past, by the highest spirits of our race, still asserts its right to the confidence of inquirers after the truth. It is founded in the deep and indestructible facts of nature, and the ineradicable laws of mind, and thus derives a necessary permanence. And there seems to be every reason to believe that men will continue, in the future, as they have done in the past, to read a revelation of the divine existence in the great universe, in the midst of which they are placed, and to feel that the process is entirely legitimate, as they still climb

> "the great world's altar-stairs
> That slope through darkness up to God."

Especially will this, probably, be so, with those who accept the statements of Revelation as worthy of more confidence than doubtful speculation, when they continue to read in it: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handi-work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge:" and "That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it to them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse."

ARTICLE II.

HOME MISSIONARY ORGANIZATION IN THE GENERAL SYNOD.

By Rev. M. Officer, York, Pa., Secretary of the Board of Home Missions.

The Church itself is responsible for the Missionary work. To it the word was committed, in trust for the world. To it the command was given, to teach all nations—to preach the gospel to every creature. From this obligation no earthly power can release it; nor can it transfer the responsibility to any substitute whatever.

Being thus responsible for the work, it is responsible for the plans, agencies and operations necessary to its performance. Hence the Church itself—whether considered as local or general—should be a missionary organization. All individual churches should be missionary bodies, and so of the general Church, formed by their association or delegation. So soon, then, as a general Church is thus formed, it would seem right and proper, that it become the principal Missionary organization, and the individual churches its auxiliaries; that it have charge of the general missionary work of the Church, devise the plans, appoint the agencies, and supervise the operations; that whatever Boards of Managers, Executive Committees, or administrative agencies of any kind, may be necessary, be under its control; and that all the particular churches co-operate with it, or rather, operate through it. This, it seems, is the missionary organization that should be, and this, perhaps, is what would be, if every individual church were imbued with an intelligent and earnest missionary spirit.

But it often happens, that the Church, as a body, does not recognize its obligations to perform this work, but neglects it, and is even indifferent towards it, while a few faithful

ones within the Church, are sensible of their duty and anxious to discharge it. In this case, certainly, these few dare not wait in idleness, till the Church, as a body, awakes to duty, and invites them to labor. On the contrary, they must do what they can, both to inaugurate and carry forward the work, and also to enlighten and influence the Church with reference thereto. To do this, they must have some sort of organization; and as, under the circumstances, it is impracticable to avail themselves of the Church organization, of which they are members, they can do no better than to form a little association within it—a sort of church within the Church—till, by means of this minor organism, the leaven of Missions pervades the greater one, and prepares it to act in the line of duty. Hence those voluntary Missionary Societies, which have, from time to time, risen in the Church, and have so largely blessed, both the Church and the world.

But, since the Church itself should be the Missionary organization, these voluntary societies within it, should not seek to become permanent substitutes for it, in the prosecution of Missions, but should endeavor to prepare the Church to do the work, and, so soon as it is thus prepared, should transfer to it the control of these operations.

If these principles are correct, it may be instructive, in the light of them, to examine

HOME MISSIONARY ORGANIZATION IN THE GENERAL SYNOD, OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, IN THE UNITED STATES.

It does not appear that, previous to the formation of the General Synod, in 1820, there existed any general Home Missionary organization in the Lutheran Church of this country. It was the custom of some of the district Synods, then existing, annually to send out one or two missionaries, on preaching tours of a few weeks or months' duration, among the vacant churches and destitute people in various parts of the country, and to defray the expenses out of the synodical treasury. In the extreme destitution that then prevailed, much good was done in this way. But the operations were of very limited extent, and no special organization was necessary to con-

duct them. But when the General Synod was founded, there was also an

ATTEMPT TO FORM A CENTRAL MISSIONARY ORGANIZATION IN THE GENERAL SYNOD.

The constitution of the General Synod then adopted, authorizes that body to "devise plans for Missionary Institutions," and to "endeavor to carry them into effect." This evidently refers, not to Educational-Missionary Institutions,—since Theological Seminaries are separately mentioned,—but to some executive agency for the management of missionary operations, In pursuance of this provision, the same convention which adopted it, appointed a committee "To form a plan of a Missionary Institution;" and the minutes of the next convention state, that the report of this committee was read, but that "A majority of the committee being absent, it was resolved to postpone the consideration thereof, and that it be referred to the same committee, to make report at the next meeting." Though the minutes of the next meeting contain no report from this committee, nor anything in relation to the subject, yet it is evident from the provision above cited, and the action based upon it, that the founders of the General Synod felt much interest on the subject of missions, and that they contemplated the formation of a general Missionary organization, directly under the control, and and for the churches, of the General Synod. In other words, they attempted to apply the principles of representation, upon which the Synod itself was based, to the affairs of missions. But the tendency in the Church towards centralization was, then, feeble; the clamor about ecclesiastical tyranny—to which the Pennsylvania Synod had now yielded, and had withdrawn from the General Synod—was loud and furious; the district Synods already had Home Mission affairs somewhat in hand, and would not readily yield them up; the General Synod had much to do in the founding of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg; and, most of all, there was but little interest felt in the cause of missions, in the Church

generally; and, under these circumstances, the General Synod felt necessitated to abandon its purpose, and leave

HOME MISSION AFFAIRS UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE DISTRICT SYNODS.

And now, from that time forward, nothing was done by the General Synod which actually interfered with the Synods, in the prosecution of this work, till the year 1845, when the Home Missionary Society of the General Synod was formed. For while some feeble attempts at centralization were made during this period, they were not such as practically to interrupt synodical plans and operations in behalf of this cause. A brief notice of what was done in this direction, will verify this statement.

The first action touching this subject, after what has been presented, was in 1833, when resolutions were passed, declaring that great destitution existed, and urging the district Synods to supply it, and also ordering the appointment of a committee, by the General Synod, to collect and publish information to aid the Synods in doing so. The committee was appointed, but never reported. In 1835, the General Synod recommended that each district Synod appoint a member of an executive committee, for the management of Home Missions, but, with a single exception, the Synods neglected to make such appointments, and the committee was not even constituted. At that same convention, however, the General Synod recommended the holding of a missionary convention, at Mechanicsburg, Pa., and this convention was accordingly held, and resulted in the formation of what was called the "*Central Missionary Society of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.*" The primary object of this association, as set forth in its constitution, was to send missionaries to the "destitute portions of the Lutheran Church in the United States." Its membership was based, not on representation, but on personal contributions to its funds. It had a "Board of Directors," and also an "Executive Committee," the latter of which was empowered to "appoint missionaries" and "agents," and to "collect and appropriate funds." It was also

to have both synodical and congregational auxiliaries." Indeed, it contemplated and attempted the formation of a *system of Societies throughout the Church.* But it does not seem to have had a long or laborious career. There is one slight reference to it, in the Minutes of the General Synod of a later date, and some traces of its existence are found in the Minutes of the Synods of Maryland, New York, and West Pennsylvania, but no reports of its *operations.* The Synods did not become its auxiliaries, in fact, though one or two did nominally, and it proved to be a "centre" without any circumference; a body without members, or a soul, perhaps, without a body, and it passed quickly and quietly away. It did not much help, and it did not at all hinder, the work of Home Missions.

After this movement, the subject of Home Missions does not appear again in the minutes of the General Synod, for eight years—and then, in 1843, the report on the state of the Church, declares that "much apathy prevails throughout the Church generally," on this subject; but no action was taken, till the next meeting, in 1845, when the Home Missionary Society of the General Synod was founded. Therefore, through all this period of twenty-five years, the *District Synods had charge of Home Missionary affairs;* and hence, in order to know what measures were employed during this time, we must refer to the

HOME MISSIONARY ARRANGEMENTS OF THE DISTRICT SYNODS.

As we have heretofore seen, the little that was done in this cause, previous to the formation of the General Synod, was done by the Synods themselves; yet as soon as increased, and more formal efforts began to be put forth, they usually took on the form of voluntary societies within these Synods. In 1828, there was formed, in the North Carolina Synod, the "Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Society of North Carolina and adjacent States." In the same year, was formed the "Parent Domestic Missionary and Education Society of the Synod of Maryland and Virginia;" but, it appears from the Minutes of the Maryland Synod, that the Synod itself trans-

acted missionary business, for the most part, till 1842, when the "Home Missionary Society of the Maryland Synod" was formed. In the year 1828, the "Domestic Missionary and Education Society of the State of New York" was founded—though both the New York Ministerium and the Hartwick Synod, seem to have transacted missionary business after that time. In 1830 the "Education and Missionary Society of the West Pennsylvania Synod" was organized; but the Minutes show that the Ministerium appointed the missionaries. These are sufficient to show the prevalence of the *society method* in the Synods during this time. And though we cannot notice the numerous smaller, local societies, formed in cities, towns, and individual churches, yet it is a fact that this same method prevailed in almost all localities; so that just as the General Synod had failed to become the Home Missionary organization for the general Church, so the district Synods failed to become such for the churches of their several districts, and the individual churches for their respective places.

In some instances, no doubt, these societies were a necessity, especially at first, as the Church would not act in the matter. But it is doubtful whether they were, in all cases; and it is certain that they sometimes continued longer than was required; for often when, in the midst of synodical session, mission matters would come up, the Synod would adjourn, and the Society, composed of the same men, or of those and others, not any more earnest in this cause, or more capable of conducting its affairs, would take its place, just as though it were wrong for the Synod, as such, to transact missionary business. Thus, practically, the missionary character of the Church was denied.

It does not come within the scope of this article, to exhibit the missionary *operations* of these Synods and their societies, in the various fields which they occupied, even if the full records were at hand to make this possible; but, from the records examined, it is manifest that the operations were not extensive. In the earlier years of this period, there was sim-

ply the traveling preacher, making his annual tours, of a few weeks or months, among the vacant churches and destitute people in various parts of the country; then, later, there was the settled missionary, occupying an extensive field, embracing numerous churches and stations; and, towards the close, there was the missionary pastor, located in a more populous, but less extended, charge. But while, in the great destitution that then existed, these labors afforded much relief, and while, during the twenty-five years of their continuance, they founded and fostered many churches, yet the sum of these labors and the results accomplished, was lamentably small for the time occupied and the numbers embraced in the Synods. To say the least, their results were not such as to show the practical efficiency of the measures employed, and thus to put to silence any objections that might be urged against the principle involved in these measures.

In one respect, particularly, these sectional organizations, whether Synods or Societies, greatly failed; and that was, to discover and to occupy the *advantageous points.* They could not, from time to time, be well acquainted with the relative needs and prospects of the different parts of the country, so as to make good selections; for, while each Synod knew its own field, it could not well know that of the others, and still less could any Synod know the vast field that lay outside of all of them, since it was not on the ground to observe, and could not afford, for the small amount of work it could carry on, to employ an agency to explore. As a general thing, therefore, the choice of the place to be occupied, was made with little or no reference to the relative needs and advantages of the whole field that lay open before the Church. But neither could these sectional organizations so well occupy an important place, even when it was known, for the reason that one of them was often unable, alone, to support a mission in a large place, and a number of them could not agree to combine in favor of any particular point. Thus, partly for want of information, and partly for want of means, this separate synodical organism failed to occupy those ad-

vantageous positions, then open to them, which in a few years would have vastly increased the influence and efficiency of the Church. In this respect, a general organization might have done better, even with the same men and means. But it must be borne in mind, that during this period there was a great lack of men, especially of such as were qualified for large and important places; and, hence, no kind of missionary organization could have, in itself, fully prevented this comparative failure. In short, the Church had neither the proper organism, nor the proper men for the great work that lay before it. It was not in any way prepared, and it has been suffering the consequences ever since.

But we pass now to notice the formation of the

HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

The attempts at centralization, heretofore noted, show that all along there were those in the General Synod, who favored a central Home Missionary organization; and their number seems to have increased, as the wants and prospects of the whole field were brought to notice, in the successive conventions of the General Synod. At length, during the convention held in Philadelphia, in 1845, the committee on the state of the Church, in concluding their report, recommended that "Efficient steps be taken to organize a Home Missionary Society." Accordingly a committee was appointed "to prepare a constitution" for a Society, and a "plan of operation," and to "nominate officers." This committee reported next day, when the constitution was "amended, adopted and referred to the Society about to be formed." And then, "after the General Synod had adjourned, the ministers and lay delegates present were called to order for the purpose of organizing." The constitution recommended by the General Synod, was adopted as received.

And now, since this Society was thus instituted, in and by the General Synod, since it was, by its constitution, called the "Society of the Synod;" since it was to meet at the same time and place with the General Synod; since it had a vice-president in each of the Synods of the General Synod, and

sought, by means of an auxiliary society and advisory committee in each Synod, to secure the co-operation of each, it was, no doubt, designed to be the Home Missionary organization for the whole Church embraced in the General Synod. But, as its constitution provided that every person who paid one dollar annually to its treasury, should be a member, and every one who paid ten dollars, at any one time, should be a life member, it was not a representative body, and had no valid authority to act for the Church, and to demand the Church's co-operation. This defect in its basis of membership proved a weakness in its operations.

An attempt was made to revise the constitution of this Society, in 1853, but is was ineffectual, and the original constitution continued till 1866, when it was so amended as materially to change the character of the Society. It will be proper, therefore, to consider, separately, the

FIRST TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF THE SOCIETY.

When the Society was formed, the General Synod embraced thirteen district Synods, and more than sixty-two thousand church members. But, the Society being only a voluntary body, within that membership, and not representative of it, could not rightfully demand the co-operation of the whole. Though many persons participated in its organization, though many more, who were in attendance at the conventions of the General Synod, from time to time, afterwards, became temporary members, by the payment of a dollar each, and participated in the proceedings, yet they did not pretend to act in a representative capacity, so as to commit the churches of their districts to the support of the Society's operations. Nor did they consider themselves bound to give their own personal support, beyond the pittance they had given for temporary membership. Each paid his dollar, as the constitution required, and then made his speech and cast his vote, and considered the account between himself and the Society even. Of transient members, to speak and vote, there were many, of actual supporters, there were few. Moreover, this irresponsible membership being, for the most part, unacquainted

with the difficulties of the work, and yet, anxious to show its zeal for the cause, often urged upon the Society large undertakings, and enjoined upon the Executive Committee things impracticable, and even impossible, under the circumstances—thus necessitating failure, and giving occasion for complaint. All this can be readily learned from the Society's records.

During the first five years, only *four* Synods, out of the *thirteen* then in the General Synod, supported the Society; and if any individual churches, not connected with these four Synods, gave any support, it was a very small amount indeed. During the next three years, the number gradually increased. Ten Synods, in all, contributed to the funds within these three years, but only *seven* of them did so, during one and the same year—some having withdrawn, on account of the rules requiring missions to make formal application, and requiring missionaries to render quarterly reports. Up to the *eighth year* of the society, then, *only seven* of the Synods co-operated at any one time, and the General Synod then embraced *twenty Synods.* But, while a little more than one-third of the Synods were then in practical union with the Society, these Synods did not embrace more than one-fourth of the membership. In view of this fact, the Executive Committee, in their report rendered at this time, 1853, urged the co-operation of the other Synods. They ask "What would become of our poor missionaries in the West, if all Eastern Synods were to spend their missionary contributions within their own borders?"

The Pittsburg Synod, having now come into the General Synod, proposed to unite with the Society "so soon as it (Society) would be organized upon a basis satisfactory to that body" (Synod); and this satisfactory basis was that of "uniting all the Synods, * * as well those which were *not* in connection with the General Synod, as those which *were!*" The Synod proposed to unite upon the condition that the Society would do an impossible thing! It was, perhaps, partly on account of this proposal, that an effort was made at this

time, to revise the constitution. The Society itself appointed a committee, composed of one member from each Synod, to amend the constitution, but the "committee did not report." It is likely that they could not at all agree. But the fact that the Society appointed this committee, composed mostly of representatives of Synods not connected with it, to revise its constitution, certainly shows large liberality on its part. It thereby proposed to commit all Home Missionary interests to the representatives of the Church then assembled, and this ought to have been satisfactory.

The report, presented at the close of the tenth year of the Society, states that the Synods then connected with it, were the Maryland, West Pennsylvania, East Pennsylvania, Miami, Wittenberg, East Ohio, Illinois, Northern Illinois, Olive Branch, South West, Kentucky, and Hartwick. But, it is evident from the minutes of the Hartwick Synod for that year, and the one previous, that this Synod did not actually co-operate, but only had some correspondence with the committee on the subject. Omitting this Synod, the number connected with the Society was *eleven*, out of the twenty-three Synods then composing the General Synod—less than half of the Synods, while the proportion of the membership was much smaller. The entire membership of the General Synod at that time, 1855, was 124,943, and that of the Synods connected with the Society, was only 42,149, a very little more than one-third, and yet this is the largest proportion that ever co-operated with the Society at any one time. For though the Society, at this time, again urged the Synods to unite, and, with a view to induce them to do so, instructed the Executive Committee to grant all applications for aid that were regularly presented, if the funds would at all admit of it, and also elected a Superintendent, with a view to more extensive and efficient operation, yet there was a gradual decline in the co-operation, and the Superintendent did not accept the position. As usual, a large number of persons besides those connected with the Synods co-operating with

the Society, participated in the proceedings of this meeting, but they failed to support the measures resolved on.

The number of Synods supporting the Society, continued to decrease, and the transient membership continued to enjoin upon the Executive Committee great undertakings, which they could not prosecute, till the close of the nineteenth year of the Society, in 1864, when it was "Resolved, That inasmuch as the General Synod is the proper representative of the Church, the Executive Committee of Home Missionary interests be transferred to the General Synod at the next meeting of that body." The object of this resolution was to get rid of the irresponsible membership, which had all along embarrassed the Society, and to put the central organization upon a proper representative basis, and thus render it more efficient. And in accordance with this idea, the Executive Committee was again instructed to appoint a Superintendent to ascertain the actual condition and prospects of the field, so as to act with greater intelligence and efficiency. A Superintendent was accordingly employed, and during the next two years, 1864 to 1866, some Synods reunited with the Society. But, even after this increase, the report presented at the close of this time, states that only "about one-third of the General Synod" was in co-operation with the Society. And this co-operation was only in part; for some of the Synods still had missions under their own separate control. All that time, therefore, less than one-third were in full co-operation; while, in the years preceding, the proportion was still smaller, perhaps not one-fourth.

We thus see that, while this Society seems to have been designed as the Home Missionary organization of the Synods and churches of the General Synod; while its founders and main supporters endeavored to make it such; and while it seems to have been expected to do the Home Mission work of the Church, yet for the first five years it embraced only four Synods out of thirteen—never at any time embraced one-half of the Synods, and only about one-third of the membership; and during the latter part of the twenty-one years now con-

sidered, only about one-fourth of the membership. On an average, therefore, throughout this period, it did not contain the one-third of the General Synod; and more than two-thirds conducted their Home Missions separately.

It is proper here to notice that, with a solitary exception, the Synods which have withdrawn from the General Synod, were of those that acted separately, and not with the Society. Of all the Synods which have left the General Synod, for political or other reasons, only one co-operated while in the General Synod, and that was the Synod of Illinois. This is a significant fact, as it shows that there were other reasons, besides that of difference of opinion as to missionary measures, for their not uniting with the Society.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE SOCIETY,

during the twenty-one years, we can but briefly notice. These are pretty fully given in the reports of the Executive Committee, presented at the successive meeting of the Society, though some of these reports are deficient in certain items.

In reference to the *Disbursements*, the reports are complete. They were only $234 the first year. They rose to $4,456 in the thirteenth year, 1858–9, and this was the highest sum attained. They fell to $921 in 1863–4; and again rose to $3,416 in 1865–6. The aggregate amount for the twenty-one years, was $40,964, being a yearly average of only $1,950.

The *number of appointments* is given in each report, but their duration is not given, so that an aggregate of the years of service is not attainable. It is manifest, however, that many of them were for less than one year. The whole number was 348, distributed in the different States, as follows; Indiana, 61; Ohio, 57; Illinois, 50; Iowa, 36; Pennsylvania, 33; Maryland, 22; Minnesota, 14; Texas, 16; Wisconsin, 7; Kentucky, 4; Michigan, 4; Kansas, 3; District of Columbia, 3; Tennessee, 1; Missouri, 1; and Nova Scotia, 1.

In the items of *organizations* formed, *houses* of *worship* built, and *members* added, some of the reports are deficient. But those reported make 148 organizations, 144 houses of worship and 4,400 accessions. As the complete reports fur-

nish a fair basis of calculation to supply the deficiencies, they may thus be made out. Filling out, in this way, the items wanting, there would be 225 organizations, 177 houses of worship, and 5,726 accessions. Some of the appointments, and the organizations resulting from them, were in country districts of sparse population, and in small villages; but still many, also, were in thriving and populous towns and cities, and have become prominent and effective churches. The results of these operations were certainly large, for the amount of funds expended; but it is only truth to say, that both expenditures and results were shamefully small, even considering the fact that the Society, during this time, embraced less than one-third of the General Synod.

The scope of this article does not admit of an inquiry into the missionary operations *of the Synods not connected with the Society* during this period. But it may, with all safety, be affirmed, that they were not twice as great as those of the Society, though, as we have seen, their numbers were double. Indeed, if their operations and the results of them, were *equal* to those of the Society, there is no evidence of the fact, either in the fields they occupied, or in the records of their proceedings. A few of the Synods, which made Home Missions a sort of specialty, did more, perhaps, during part of this time, than the average of the Society; but others did far less, and those less active Synods constituted the majority; and the aggregate results were certainly not equal to those of the Society. The trial, therefore, of these two methods, side by side, for twenty-one years, does not furnish any proof of the advantages of separate synodical operations in this cause. Moreover, since both methods have thus been tried in fields which the friends of each declared to be promising, and have grievously failed, it would seem that the real want, after all, was not so much that of organization, or plan, as of hearty interest in the cause. An earnest missionary spirit in the Church generally, would, in these twenty-one years, either have wrought out vastly greater results, through the organizations then existing, or would have created some other organism, and made it effective.

THE SOCIETY UNDER ITS AMENDED CONSTITUTION.

We have seen that after a long experience with a voluntary Society, it was resolved, at the meeting of 1864, that at the next meeting, this voluntary organization should be abandoned, and the Home Mission interests transferred to the General Synod. But, before the General Synod met in 1866, the Executive Committee became persuaded, from the disposition manifested by the district Synods, that so great a change could not at that time be effected. In view of this fact, they appended to their report, two recommendations for the consideration of the Society, in case the General Synod did not assume control of Home Mission affairs. The first recommendation was, that the Society be dissolved, and the missions distributed among the Synods. Or, if this were not agreed to, then, secondly, that the constitution of the Society be so changed, as to put its membership essentially upon a representative basis.

The General Synod not being then prepared to take charge of missions, these recommendations came before the Society, when the first one was rejected, and the alternative adopted. Accordingly the constitution was changed. By the amendment, the membership was henceforth to consist—"*First*, of all delegates to the General Synod, from Synods co-operating with the Society;" *Secondly*, of all ministers who, with their charges, co-operate; and, *Thirdly*, of all persons duly constituted life members," whose rights, of course, the Society could not repudiate. Thus, the irresponsible membership was shaken off, and a great advance was made toward centralization on the proper basis. And, though the Society was still continued, as an organization distinct from the General Synod, yet there was, at the same time, provision made for it to be merged into the General Synod, as soon as the latter body and the district Synods were prepared for such additional advance. It was provided that, "if at any time, thereafter all the Synods composing the General Synod should cease their separate Home Missionary operations, and co-operate with the Society, then, if the General Synod chose so to do, it should take charge of Home Missionary interests and

work." There were some other minor amendments, but they were chiefly such as were necessary to the unity of the whole, upon this new basis, together with the incorporation of a few things, which had previously been authorized by resolutions—such as the employment of a Superintendent, and the defining of his relation to the Executive Committee and to the work. The provision for an Advisory Committee in each Synod, was retained, so that through it, the Executive Committee could keep in communication with each part of the Church co-operating with the Society.

Under this amended constitution, the Society continued but *three years*, as, at the end of that time, the General Synod itself assumed control of Home Missions, and the Society was dissolved. We have, therefore, only briefly to note its strength and operations during this short period.

We have heretofore seen that there was an increased support given to it at the time when the revision took place. This continued afterwards, and soon nearly all the Synods which had once been connected with it and had withdrawn, re-united. In addition, some Synods, formed in the first part of this period, of portions of those Synods, which had now left the General Synod for doctrinal reasons, also united. These, together, made the number of Synods connected with the Society larger than at any former time; and though some of them were small, yet, as the numbers of the General Synod had now been reduced by the withdrawal of the opposition Synods, they constituted the larger part of the General Synod, being thirteen out of twenty Synods then comprising that body. For the first time, the Society now had the co-operation of one-half of the General Synod. But some of these Synods, still having missions under their own separate care, gave only partial support to the Society.

The *disbursements*, during this time, were $14,523, or $4,841 per annum—the average being some $400 more than was ever attained before in any single year.

The number of *appointments* was much smaller, in proportion to the expenditures, than formerly. This was owing to the fact that, in a large measure, the Executive Committee

had ceased to occupy the numerous small fields presented, and had undertaken a number of missions in large towns and cities, which, of course, were more expensive than those previously sustained. But the average time for which these appointments were made, was longer than before, as very few were for less than one year. The number was 39, or 13 a year; and they were thus distributed among the States, viz: in Ohio, 10; in Missouri, 9; in Kansas, 6; in Iowa, 4; in West Virginia, 3; in Illinois, 3; in Pennsylvania, 2; in Wisconsin, 1; in Indiana, 1.

The number of *accessions* is not reported for the last year, but for the first two, it was 458, and as the number of appointments was more than half as large for the last year as for the first two, we may add one-half, at least, to the above figures for the last year, making, for the three years, 682, or 227 a year. During this time, there were 25 Sunday Schools sustained, numbering about 2,500 scholars.

The reports given do not show how many organizations were formed, or how many houses of worship were built. But it is safe to say that more was done in the way of building, than during any former term of three years, for in this time the Synods connected with the Society gave to missions under its care, upwards of $13,000 for the purchase of church lots, and the erection of houses of worship; and the missions themselves raised more for these purposes than during any former period of three years. Upon the whole, there certainly was considerable improvement in the strength and efficiency of the Society under its amended constitution.

But there was one serious defect in the arrangement, and that was in the want of any abiding and certain connection between the Society and the Synods. There was no permanent league or compact between them. On the contrary, the continuance of the union depended on the annual renewal of it. Often this could not be done by correspondenee, but required the attendance of the Superintendent, or a member of the Executive Committee, which involved a large expenditure of time and means, and even this effort sometimes failed. This uncertainty of support, kept the Committee in constant

embarrassment in their operations, particularly in entering upon new undertakings, as it would be useless to begin a new enterprise unless there were some certainty of being able to continue it.

Besides this uncertainty of support, the correspondence had now become so burdensome, to say nothing of the other things demanding the attention of the Secretary, that a pastor could not spare the time to conduct it; and yet the amount of funds at the disposal of the Society, did not seem to justify the employment of a paid Secretary. It was, therefore, felt to be necessary to the success of a central organization, that the union of the Synods with it be made permanent, and that its numbers be also increased. Some who had all along sustained the Society, now felt that if these things could not be secured, it would be better to abandon the central organization altogether, and refer the whole matter of Home Missions to the district Synods. But it was thought that they could be secured through a

BOARD OF MANAGERS OF HOME MISSIONS,

appointed by the General Synod, which had now become prepared for such action.

At the same convention of 1866, at which the constitution of the Society was revised, a committee was appointed by the General Synod to revise the the constitution of the Synod, with a view to centralization in general. The revision was presented, and adopted in 1868; and being, in the meantime, ratified by the district Synods, was declared in force at the convention of 1869, in Washington City. The revised constitution authorizes the General Synod to take charge of the Home Mission interests and operations of the Church, and to appoint a Board of Managers to conduct them, subject only to the General Synod. The constitution does not declare that this provision shall immediately go into effect, but that the General Synod shall create such Board "whenever practicable and expedient." But, as the Synods that had all along been influenced, by doctrinal differences, against centralization in the General Synod, had now withdrawn; as all

that were now in the General Synod had, by their ratification of the constitution, approved of the measure; and as more than half of them were then in practical connection with the Society, it was thought practicable and expedient to carry the provision into effect at once. Moreover, since the Society, as then constituted, could not efficiently prosecute the work, it was felt necessary to make the change without delay. Accordingly, the General Synod assumed the control of these interests and appointed the Board.

The simple appointment of such a Board by the General Synod, "as the representative body of all the Synods connected therewith," itself implies that the Board is for all the Synods, or the whole Church of the General Synod, and is, by virtue of its appointment, empowered and obligated to take charge of the Home Mission affairs of the Church. The constitution authorizes the Board to "make the regulations necessary for the management of its own affairs," and to "appoint its own officers;" and it requires the Board to "keep a record of its proceedings," and to "make report of the same to the General Synod." But, beyond this, no instruction was given to the Board.

In pursuance of its appointment, the Board elected officers, adopted regulations, took charge of the missions, funds, books, and papers of the Society, which had been disbanded; and then requested the district Synods, as soon as practicable, to transfer to it their Home Missions and Home Mission funds; and also asked each Synod to appoint an Advisory Committee, with which the Board might communicate in regard to Home Mission affairs within its bounds, and thus keep advised of the wants and prospects in every part of the whole field, and be able to act with reference to the interests of the whole.

The Board has been in operation less than two years. Within the first year, all the Synods, except two, resolved to conform to the requirements of the General Synod and the Board, but three of those which thus resolved, have not yet actually co-operated with the Board—have not contributed

to its funds—on account of the complicated or unsettled state of their missionary affairs. *Five*, therefore, have thus far failed practically to comply with the arrangement, leaving sixteen in actual co-operation; being three more than were at any time connected with the former Society. But several of these being much in debt, when the Board was appointed, have used part of their funds to liquidate these debts, and hence have given to the Board only a part of the funds raised during the first year.

The *disbursements* during the first year, were $9,245, being almost double the highest sum attained in any one year by the Society. The appointments were forty-three, and almost every one of them was for a whole year. They were thus distributed in the States; 13 in Pennsylvania; 3 in New York; 2 in West Virginia; 4 in Ohio; 1 in Michigan; 2 in Illinois; 4 in Iowa; 3 in Missouri; 3 in Kansas; and 1 in Oregon.

Many of the missions having been transferred to the Board by the Synods, the number of organizations effected during that year was not ascertained by the Board, but it was not large. The whole number of organizations under the care of the Board, that year, was 84, and of these, 63 had houses of worship, 8 of which were erected during the year. The *accessions* were 786, being about twice the number added in any one year under the Society. In connection with the missions, there were 62 Sunday Schools, with 4,919 scholars. The missions themselves raised for salaries of missionaries, church property, and objects of benevolence, $31,500. These figures show a large increase in the operations of the Board, over those of the Society; and, therefore, viewed with reference to the past in our Church, they show progress, and afford some encouragement; and they may also furnish some evidence that the plan now in operation, is a proper one, though the time during which the Board has been tested, is too short to afford any reliable proof, from experiment, either for or against it. But viewed with reference to the numbers represented in the Board, and to any just standard of duty on their part, the operations are lamentably small. For, to say

nothing of the five Synods, which have not yet practically complied with the obligations assumed in this matter, the numbers of those which have, are such as to demand much greater operations and results. As heretofore, no doubt, the delinquency is partly caused by the want of men suited to to the mission work in important places; for this want is still sorely felt. But, as in former periods, and under other forms of organization, it is caused, to a still larger extent, by the want of an *intelligent and true missionary zeal.* This, as we have heretofore seen, has all along been the main defect, and it continues to be the chief want at present. Because of this want, every form of effort, and every plan, has largely failed; and while it continues, they will, in a large measure, continue to fail. Humiliating as it may be, to admit it, this is the simple truth. He who seeks to ignore or conceal it, does not thereby befriend the cause of missions or the Church; for it is not a slight error, to be overlooked, but a grievous sin, to be confessed and repented of.

But, while no form of organization can be a substitute for a proper missionary zeal, or can, in itself, remedy the want thereof, nevertheless, right organization has something to do in fostering that zeal, as well as in rendering effective the efforts that are put forth. On this account, it is very important that the organization be founded on true principles, for it is impossible for a Church, or a man, to become truly great on false principles. And now, if the views presented at the beginning of this article are correct, then the main features, at least, of the present organization, would seem to be right. It is

ONE CENTRAL ORGANIZATION BY THE WHOLE CHURCH AND FOR THE WHOLE CHURCH.

In its full extent, the organization is the *Church itself;* for the Church, through its delegates to the General Synod, has taken charge of Home Mission affairs, and now controls them. The Board, to which it temporarily commits the management of these affairs, is not the *substitute*, but only the *agent* of the Church, and, as an agent, is under the authority

and direction of the Church, which, according to the divine injunction, has now recognized its responsibility in this great matter.

Moreover, this Board of Managers—or organization in a more limited sense—is authorized, appointed, and directed *by the whole Church*, and not by any one part of it. Each section, or part, participated in enacting the constitutional provisions, under which the Board is formed, and also in the appointment of the Board; and each still has its share in directing it. The central Board, therefore, is instituted and controlled by the Church as a whole, through equitable representation.

Again, as this Board is *by* the whole Church, so it is *for* the whole. It is not for itself, nor for any one part in particular, but equally for each and for all. Nor is it against any one part, unless that part is against the whole. It may, for a time, do much more in one section than in another, because the needs and prospects there are greater, and more will result from so doing, but not because of sectional considerations. The Board is for the interests of the cause and of the Church, as a whole; and since the whole is greater than a part, this would seem to be right.

Furthermore, as the Board is by the whole Church, and for the whole Church, it should have the co-operation of the whole; not for its own sake, but for the sake of the cause. Since the Church has employed the Board as its agent, and has enjoined on it the prosecution of this work, it should provide the means necessary to do so. Since all sections have mutually agreed to the arrangement, all should mutually stand to it, and support the operations, as long as the plan continues. This much is demanded by common fairness and integrity among the Synods associated, to say nothing of the higher claims of the cause for which the arrangement was made.

It appears, then, that the present organism is founded on right principles, and is the proper agency for conducting the Home Missions of the Church, unless, after all, this work should not be classed with the general operations of the

Church, but with those that are simply local or sectional. But if it is simply local, then each church should act separately, and there would be no combination of effort whatever; or, if it is regarded as sectional, how shall the *extent* of the section be determined? What right has a district Synod to assume, that the limits of the section shall be those of its territory, and thus to make the work *general for that district*, and then to demand that the churches thereof shall co-operate for *the common good*, if the work is not at all general, and if the common good is not to be regarded? But if the sections were once determined, and made identical with the Synods, so that each could act by itself, and for itself, would it be found that those Synods which have the most means, have, at the same time, the most needy, most promising, and most extensive fields? Is not the contrary of this true, as a rule? Would these stronger Synods, then, in order to adhere to the sectional plan, rather comparatively waste their means within their own bounds, than employ them to advantage for the cause elsewhere? If so, would this indicate an intelligent missionary spirit? Or, if it is proposed that the stronger Synods supplement the labors of the weaker ones, and thus adjust the inequalities throughout the territory of all, would not this be to make the work general for that whole territory, and for all the churches embraced in it? Thus, taking into account only that part of this labor which lies within the Synods, and which could with most propriety be construed as sectional, it cannot fairly be so considered—how much less, then, that large part which lies outside of the Synods! It may be admitted, that part of the work might be considered as rather local than general, but it would be the smaller part. Upon the whole it is not so; but is of a general character, and can, with most fitness, be committed to a general organization.

But it may be argued that, though this work is rather general than sectional, yet, in order to avoid the complication, friction, and expense of a central organism, it would be better to conduct it on a sectional basis, by distributing it among the Synods, giving each an appropriate share. This

is plausible, and not altogether erroneous: for the attendants of a general body, just mentioned, are objectionable, and should be avoided if practicable; and certainly something could be done in the way indicated. But could the Synods, acting separately, and without any general arrangement, effect such division and distribution with any tolerable degree of thoroughness and justness? Could they, in this manner, so arrange that the stronger would supplement the labors of the weaker, throughout their various sections, and then distribute among themselves the common territory outside, so as to give each a proper part, and no two the same part? Or, if the arrangement were once made, could it be kept up, under the numerous changes constantly occurring? Is it not at once plain, that to do all this, without any general body or plan, and amid the conflicting opinions, preferences and projects of the different sections, would involve more complication, friction and expenditure of time, if not of means, than to conduct the operations by a central Board; and though none of the sectional bodies might employ a paid agency, yet the time which, in the aggregate, they would spend, in order to dispense with such an agency, would be more than equal to the entire time of the one man, whom the central body must employ: and this would be just so much taken from other departments of service, so that the saving to the church is rather seeming than real; to say nothing of the superior service which a man can render in this, or any other work, when he makes it his business and study, and has the varied experience which a central position would soon give him. But, in addition to all this, it is a fact known to all who have given any attention to the subject, that much more Home Mission work is presented to our Church, than it can, or at least will do, and therefore, it seems most proper to select out of it what, from time to time, is most necessary and important in the whole field; and it is manifest, that such selection cannot be as well made by numerous Synods, acting separately, with no common plan, and with only parts of the field before them respectively, as by one body having the whole field before it, and being able thus to compare the con-

dition of one part with that of another. Upon the whole, then, the distributive plan, if at all practicable, would be liable to the same objections, which may be urged against centralization, while it would be less effective.

But it may, again, be argued, that, though the operations in the field can be better conducted by a central body, yet more funds can be raised for the support of the operations, if the work is made sectional. If this is true at all, it must be, either because the fields lying in the stronger districts, and near the able and liberal churches, from which most of the funds must come, are uniformly more needy and more promising than others, and therefore would more strongly appeal to the charity and enlightened zeal of these churches; or else, because the churches will give more money to a less deserving and less important mission near home, than they will to a more worthy one, at a distance. But it is manifest to any observer, that the best fields do not usually lie near the strong and liberal churches; and if the churches will habitually do more for less deserving missions, merely because they are nearer home, then, in the first place, these churches are not so purely and thoroughly missionary, in character and spirit, as to be made the standard and model for missionary plans and operations; and, in the second place, if more funds were secured, and yet were spent on less needy and less important fields, the amount of good resulting therefrom, might still be less than if a smaller amount were better expended.

If, then, this work is to be conducted with a view to the interests of the cause in the wide field which lies open before us, and with a view to the good of the whole Church; if it is to be prosecuted with any tolerable degree of energy, and to any proper extent; and if this is to be done in anything like the true spirit of missions, it seems that the form of organization now in use is the proper one, and may well be continued.

But, if the Synods and churches should practically ignore the true character and real extent of this work, and should determine to do little or nothing for it, except in their own immediate and respective localities, thus reducing it to a

merely sectional or local affair; then a central organization would be unnecessary. Or, if after instituting the arrangement, they should, through a spirit of indifference, provide so small an amount of means to carry on the operations, as to render efficiency, on the part of the Board, impossible, and should then urge that want of efficiency as an excuse for still greater neglect, then the continuance of the empty plan would be of no avail, while its repeal would, by removing one of the pleas of indifference, help a little to show where the fault lies. Or, if instead of heartily uniting to promote a great common cause, as the plan contemplates, the Synods should enter into mutual contention for the limited means that might be in the common treasury, then there would be no need for a Mission Board to preside over such a conflict.

In short, if after due time, and a fair trial, it should be found that, from any cause, the Church is still actually unprepared for the more orderly and thorough measures of centralization—though it has authorized and inaugurated them—it would certainly be as well to suspend the constitutional provision for the creation of a central Board, dissolve the Board itself, distribute the present missions among the Synods, in the best manner practicable, and refer the whole interest of Home Missions to the district Synods. For surely no one will contend that centralization, in this matter, is an absolute necessity, or that separate synodical action is, in itself, morally wrong. Nor does any one suppose that the central Board should be maintained for its own sake, or that it should sustain and carry forward this arduous labor in spite of the Church, or independently of it. It was only designed as the medium through which the Church might operate in this great cause, and if, by reason of any hindrances whatever, it cannot be made to subserve the end for which it was designed, it should be formally dissolved by the same authority that created it.

ARTICLE III.

THE PROPOSED RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT TO OUR NATIONAL CONSTITUTION.

By Rev. L. A. Gotwald, Chambersburg, Pa.

The public mind, for some time past, has had its attention directed, in various ways, to the subject of a proposed religious amendment of our national Constitution. Numerous, able, and plausible articles, in its behalf, have appeared, from time to time, in the columns both of the secular and religious press of the land. Well written circulars, advocating it as an imperative national necessity, have found their way into thousands of homes. Pulpits have eloquently argued and pleaded for it. And several large conventions, composed of excellent and able Christian men, representing almost all the so-called orthodox and Protestant churches, have been held—one during the past year, in the month of March, in the city of Pittsburg, and one recently in the city of Philadelphia. And thus, in every possible manner, has a favorable impression, in behalf of this movement, been sought to be made.

But, notwithstanding the influential and highly respectable names connected with it, and the earnest aggression and agitation of its friends and advocates, it has, thus far at least, failed to receive much real approval, and is, as yet, by no means, a *popular* movement. Public sentiment regards it either with avowed hostility or undisguised suspicion. There is not a particle of national enthusiasm in its favor. The instincts of the people are all against it. They have no sympathy for this new-born bantling.

And we do not wonder at this. For, plausible as this proposed Christianizing of our nation by the "short and easy method" of merely amending our national Constitution, seems to be, there are yet such clear and weighty objections

to it, that the people, to endorse it, must first utterly ignore all the principles of their past political education, and, in addition to that, must totally disregard the Divine Redeemer's "Golden Rule," of ever doing to our fellow-men as we would that they should do unto us.

We propose, in the remarks that follow, to point out some of these objections; and will seek to show that the proposed religious Amendment should receive the immediate and most decided opposition of all classes of American citizens.

1. From the very nature of the case, it is an amendment which must ever, either as expressing too much or too little, be *unsatisfactory and objectionable.* Within the last decade of our civil history, three amendments have been made to our national Constitution. The "Thirteenth Amendment" abolished slavery, that wrong of centuries, wherever the jurisdiction of this nation extends. The "Fourteenth Amendment" defined and settled the question of citizenship, and prohibited any State from passing any law abridging the rights of citizens. And the "Fifteenth Amendment" clothed the colored man with the ballot—a shield for the protection of human rights—for

> "It executes a freeman's will
> As lightning does the will of God."

Now, in all these amendments, there were single and clearly defined issues presented for discussion. Each amendment asked precisely so much; no more, no less; and what it then asked was the full measure of the one well-defined object desired. It was not a matter which could be compromised, or settled by only partly obtaining what it demanded. It demanded all or nothing. And hence each man, in casting his ballot, cast it for what he wanted, or did not want; and for what, if he obtained it, would be perfectly right and satisfactory to him; or for what, if carried against his vote, would to him be all wrong and unsatisfactory. And hence, also, when once, in a constitutional way, three-fourths of the Legislatures ratified these amendments, they were immediately

acquiesced in by the people, and then was, at once, everywhere, inaugurated a new order of things in harmony with the amendments then made. But, it seems to us, that, in the very nature of the case, this proposed religious amendment can never, save, possibly, to an exceedingly insignificant minority, be satisfactory. Frame it as you will, include in it much or little, to some it will be objectionable, on the ground of containing too much, and to others on the opposite ground of containing too little. In other words, it does not so much raise the question of religion itself, as it does the question of quantity, and of specific form and article of religious faith. Amidst almost infinite diversity of religious belief, existing in the land, it attempts to make our national Constitution declare, as an ultimate and infallible oracle, what constitutes an American citizen a Christian, and what special articles of religious belief he must first, under oath, subscribe to before he can fill certain political or civil offices. Can any such amendment, under the circumstances, ever be satisfactory to a majority, or even to a considerable minority, of the people? On the contrary, if, in some arbitrary way, it were now really part of the Constitution, would it not necessarily, in proportion as men hold their respective religious beliefs positively and conscientiously, at once, produce agitation and bitterness of feeling throughout our whole land? There is, in our mind, no doubt, that such would be the result. And, as a confirmation of this, and as a proof of the utter impossibility of one body of men legislating in matters of religion for another, or of even the same body legislating authoritatively in such matters for itself, we need only here refer to the fact, that even the advocates of this movement, in their late convention in Philadelphia, were not in complete harmony concerning the subject-matter of their "platform." The Rev. Dr. J. Edwards, we are told by one of the public papers, as chairman of the business committee, reported a series of six resolutions. The Rev. Dr. J. H. M'Ilvaine, after much discussion, offered a substitute. This substitute, however, we are told, "after much discussion, pro

and contra, was negatived, and then the original resolutions were adopted."

2. A religious amendment to the Constitution, such as is proposed, would, as a means, be entirely insufficient and inadequate to secure the moral ends or results which are aimed at.

The form of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

"We, the people of the United States, *acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority*, in order *to constitute a Christian government*, to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish *the following* Constitution."

And one of the resolutions adopted at the recent Philadelphia convention, is thus worded:

Resolved, That, in view of the controlling power of the Constitution in shaping State as well as National policy, it is of immediate importance, to public morals and social order, to secure such an amendment as will indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place Christian laws, institutions, and usages, in our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of our nation—specially those which secure a proper oath, and which protect society against blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and polygamy.

From these papers, thus officially published as the sense of the convention, we learn that the moral ends to be attained are, "to constitute this a Christian government;" "to indicate to the world that this is a Christian nation;" "to place Christian laws, institutions, and usages, in our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of our nation;" and "specially to secure a proper oath, to protect society against blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and polygamy." In a word, it is expected, by the friends of this movement, that the mere insertion, in the Preamble to the Constitution, of the words "acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus

Christ as the Ruler among the nations, and His revealed will as of supreme authority," will, like some lamp of Aladdin, work wonders, regenerating the whole nation in a day, and transforming the people, everywhere throughout our borders, into models of morality and piety.

Now, we accord to the advocates of this amendment, the utmost purity of motive; we admire also their Christian zeal and jealousy for the Divine glory; and with them, with all our soul, we desire and pray for the attainment of these same moral and religious ends. But we must respectfully, at the same time, avow it as our positive conviction, that no such moral and religious results would at all follow from any such constitutional amendment. No such desirable and beneficial *effects* would be produced by this contemplated *cause;* simply because they do not, save in the fervid imaginations of the friends of the movement, sustain to each other a real relation as cause and effect. At least, we are totally unable to see how, in the least degree, any such religious amendment of our national Constitution, will amend either the lives or hearts of our citizens. We do not see how it will operate so as to improve the standard of our national morals and piety. That there is abundant need for such improvement, from the President and Congress down to every rank and class of society, we heartily admit; but that this proposed amendment of the Constitution will effect such needed improvement, we doubt. A recent able editorial in the *New York Independent* so well expresses this thought, that we cheerfully here introduce it:

"We cannot see that such an amendment would make any soul better. When bills of lading had long and pious preambles in regard to the protection of God, skippers did not swear any less, ship-owners were not more pious, and shippers were none the less rascally. It is quite probable that when the sanctimonious underwriters used pious phrases they overcharged their patrons, who, in turn, were just as liable to fall into arson, or other such crime, as they are to-day. A candid review of the history of religious phrases, does not impress us with their sanctifying influences.

For the old kings whose coins were religiously stamped with '*Dei Gratia*,' were, many of them, most irreligious rulers. 'By the grace of God' they ate up the substance of the poor, and 'by the grace of God' they put to death the innocent. By the grace of God, Ferdinand sent the Jews by tens and hundreds of thousands of men and women and little children wandering in a hopeless exile, that this 'grace of God' might overflow his coffers with the doubloons of which they had been plundered. By the grace of God, Indians were killed, and negroes enjoyed the blessings of the Middle passage. By the grace of God the Inquisition grew and flourished. In our own day, we have seen one republic that solemnly acknowledged God in its constitution, and the example is not an attractive one. The 'Confederate States of America' adopted a religious constitution, under which it stole the labor of stolen men and women, waged unrighteous war, starved helpless prisoners, and met the fate which its crimes deserved.

God is not to be praised by joint resolution or worshiped in constitutional amendments. We may deceive ourselves into the belief that a constitutional amendment is an acceptable tribute to the Father. But God is not a 'proud baillie-like bodie' to be imposed upon by empty flattery of this sort. A nation means so many individual men, women, and children, with every one of whom God keeps open a personal account. All the constitutional amendments in the world could not have made the sins of Sodom less obnoxious."

To all of which, we heartily respond, *Amen.* And only add that, inadequate as *legislation*, in our opinion, thus is, for the religious improvement and culture of the nation, there is an adequate power for the attainment of this end, if only faithfully put forth, in the *Church* of the Lord Jesus Christ. In its word and sacraments; in its indwelling Divine Saviour; in its ever-present Divine Spirit; in its sublime motives drawn from the solemn realities of eternity; in the irresistible power, over men's hearts and consciences, of the truth as Jehovah has committed it to her; in all the diversified talents of learning, of wealth, of eloquence, of influence, which

God, in His Providence, has here in this land bestowed so richly upon her; in all these there exists the nation's needed moral and religious help. The *Church* is the Divine power—and the only power—that can make this nation, or any nation, moral, God-fearing, and Christian.

3. But, we not only thus regard the proposed amendment as insufficient and inadequate for the attainment of moral ends, but we go further, and assert that, in our judgment, such an amendment would be productive of positive moral evil and injury.

We either do, or we do not, as a nation, "acknowledge Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, and the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, and His revealed will as of supreme authority." If the majority of this nation do really, in their hearts, feel and believe all that such an acknowledgment expresses, then it would not, in our opinion, under all the circumstances, be necessary or best, in our national Constitution, to avow such belief. But to make such an avowal, to do it as the solemn and official act of the nation, when, as is undoubtedly now the case, there is no such real and heartfelt acknowledgment or belief, would be simply a flagrant act of dishonesty and hypocrisy. And nothing is so demoralizing and injurious to both national and individual integrity as insincerity and hypocrisy. And nothing, perhaps, sooner and more severely incurs the just displeasure of Jehovah, than the sin of hollow pretensions to morality and piety. This is one view of the matter.

But there is another view of it. Such an amendment would require of persons elected or appointed to certain civil offices, an oath attesting their unreserved and *ex animo* belief of the religious tenets which it expresses. And whilst many could and would, no doubt, take such an oath honestly and sincerely, yet how many, on the other hand, would, in their hungry greed for office, take it dishonestly. What an occasion of perjury it would prove to many. And how, instead of securing "a proper oath," which, as one of the resolutions of the late Philadelphia convention declares, is one of the

express objects of the amendment, the very amendment itself would be a constant and prolific source of improper and false oaths.

Thus, and in other ways which might be cited, the practical results of an amendment such as is proposed, would not only not be good, but would be positively evil and injurious. Or, as the Rev. Dr. Spear, of the Presbyterian Church, has well said—

"The insertion of religious dogmas in constitutions of government may be very potent for *evil*, and they often have been and, indeed, are generally so; but their history is very far from revealing a system of benefits to either state or church. They incite the people to no social or spiritual virtues which they would not equally practice without them. They form no guaranty that the government will be practically just and Christian in its legislation. They are neither an argument nor a persuasion. They are not a means of grace to the national heart; they do not help to disseminate true religion among men; they do not add to the general sense of responsibility to God; and over the convictions and moral movements of the individual mind they have no authority whatever. In one word, they would add nothing to the weight and power of Christianity for good. They would simply force it into an unnatural and dangerous alliance, without any benefit to anybody. The best that can be said for them, is that they would gratify the religious *tastes* by giving formal expression to the views of a certain class of men."

4. But this entire movement is objectionable upon another ground. It rests, we think, upon a totally false assumption. The assumption which it makes, and upon which it bases its claims, is that this nation of ours is *not* a Christian nation; or that it, at least, has never yet officially and with sufficient clearness, *declared* itself to be such a nation. But is this a correct assumption? We think not. On the contrary, our impression is that, upon the face of the whole earth, there is not another nation so essentially and truly *Christian* as is ours. And, further, we hold that no other nation has ever,

in such innumerable and various modes, officially, and in its national character, *declared* its acceptance of the Christian religion, as contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. That the great majority of the people of our land are truly God-fearing and pious, we do not claim. In this sense of personal Christian life and character, we do not, at all, assert this to be a Christian nation. And, in this sense, no other nation is Christian. In this sense even under the Theocracy, the Jewish people were not Christian. And, in this sense, at least until the Millenium comes, there will not be a Christian nation. But we yet maintain that, above any other nation, ours is imbued and moulded by the influences and teachings of Christianity. Christianity is more of a vital force—it has more grasp upon men's consciences—it permeates more all the national habits and customs—it influences and determines the literature and education more—it enters more into the jurisprudence—it receives more formal and outward respect here, than anywhere else. And no where else are its public ordinances better attended; its sacred Scriptures more extensively and generally circulated; its Sabbath day better observed; its ministry voluntarily and more liberally maintained; its benevolent and religious operations more energetically and successfully conducted; its influence upon the home and family more direct and powerful, than here in our own land. We maintain, therefore, that it is a misrepresentation, even by assumption or implication, to declare that we are *not* a Christian nation.

But, we are told, there is no sufficient official or organic avowal of our Christian faith and character. We do not, we are told, as a *nation*, declare ourselves Christian. Let us look at this for a moment. That there was, during the *colonial* period of the history of our country, repeated and distinct official declarations of Christianity as the only true religion, even the resolutions of the recent Philadelphia Convention admit; and hence we need not cite evidence of the fact. In the year 1774, the first Continental Congress met, and organized what is generally called the "Revolutionary

Government." This government continued until 1781, when that form of government, usually termed the "Conferation of the States," was established. In 1787, our present Constitution was adopted. Now we unhesitatingly affirm that, under each one of these forms of government, from 1774 down to this present "year of our Lord" 1871, Christianity has received full and cordial recognition by the public authorities. That such is indeed the case is confirmed by the amplest testimony. In the Delaration of Independence, there is, as we all know, "an appeal to the Supreme Judge of the world;" and "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence," is clearly expressed. Certain acts of the Continental Congress are also, most decidedly, of a Christian character, viz.: the opening of the sessions with prayer; attendance upon divine service in a body; the importation of twenty thousand copies of the Bible; and the appointment of Christian ministers as chaplains in the army of the Revolution.

In 1778, Congress passed a preamble and resolution, which are in part as follows: "*Whereas, true religion and good morals are the only foundations of public liberty and happiness, Resolved, That it be, and hereby is, earnestly recommended to the several States to take the most effectual measures for the encouragement thereof.*"

In the proclamations for fasts and thanksgiving days, issued by the Continental Congress, we find such expressions as the following, in the respective years here mentioned.

In 1777: "That it may please God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, mercifully to forgive our sins and blot them out of remembrance."

In 1779: "And above all, that He hath diffused the glorious light of the Gospel, whereby, through the merits of our gracious Redeemer, we may become the heirs of His eternal glory." Also, "That He would grant to His Church the plentiful effusion of divine grace, and pour out His Holy Spirit on all ministers of the gospel."

In 1782: "That He would take under His guardianship all schools and seminaries of learning, and make them nurseries of virtue and piety."

Surely, facts like these prove most conclusively that the Continental Congress recognized the Christian religion and the Holy Scriptures.

The general orders of Washington, as Commander-in-Chief of the army, are also replete with expressions of Christian sentiments, and abound with instructions to observe the Christian Sabbath, to attend Christian divine worship, to avoid profane language, and to cultivate religion and morality. In all the State Constitutions, adopted during this period, there is also a greater or less recognition of the Christian religion, New York alone excepted. But how is it, we are asked, during our present *Constitutional* period? We will, in reply, here avail ourselves of the research and information of another. From a sermon by the Rev. F. W. Brauns, pastor of the Broadway Presbyterian Church of Cincinnati, we quote as follows: "We are often met by the assertion that there is no recognition of God, or the Christian religion in the Constitution, and that the people, by the adoption of that instrument, have banished the Deity and religion from our National Government. Even if this charge against the Constitution were true, the conclusion here mentioned would by no means necessarily follow. The Constitution is not the whole of our governmental organization, though it forms a very important part.

The facts are abundant to prove that the Christian religion is still acknowledged by the Government, as the religion of our nation, and the Almighty is recognized and worshiped by our public authorities, as the Author of our liberties and the Arbiter of our destinies.

There is no evidence of any *design* to omit this recognition of God and the Christian religion. There were acts of the convention while in session displaying a spirit that would have denounced any intention of this kind. On Benjamin Franklin's motion, the sessions were opened with prayer. Franklin declared his belief that the successful result of their labors was attributable to the fact that their transactions had been 'influenced, guided, and governed by that omnipotent

and beneficent Ruler, in whom all inferior spirits live and move and have their being.'

The Constitution encountered opposition on the very ground of the omission of religious sentiments. It is said that the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton, N. J., complained to Alexander Hamiltion of this omission, and was informed by him that it was an oversight—the matter had not occurred to the minds of the members of the convention. In several of the State conventions held to consider the question of the adoption of the Constitution, objection was made that there was no religious test. The people had been accustomed to it. Nearly all the State Constitutions contained it, and it was only after long discussion that the instrument was approved. Every State that adopted it, as we have already seen, had in its own Constitution a recognition of religion, in most of them it being of a very decided character. It is evident, from this fact, that the States approved it with the understanding that the Christian religion was still a fundamental element in the government of the nation.

Whilst, however, there is no such distinct announcement, as many would have desired, the Constitution does, in several particulars, by implication, recognize our holy religion. It is contended that the declaration that it was adopted 'in the year of our Lord 1787,' disproves the charge of atheism or infidelity against the instrument. In no less than four places does it require the administration of an oath; and the oaths of Congress are administered with the hand on the Bible, and the direct appeal to the Almighty, 'So help me God.' Here a recognition of the Bible as the word of God, and of the Almighty as the Great Judge and Ruler of all.

The Constitution provides that in counting the ten days in which the President may retain a bill before signing it, or returning it to Congress, Sunday is not to be counted. Here is a clear recognition of the sanctity of the Lord's day. Even the thoughts of the President are on that day to be separated from his official duties, so that he may remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The Lord's day is a Christian

institution, and the Constitution, in making this provision for its observance, recognizes the divine origin of the religion of which it is so important a feature.

It is contended by some that, by virtue of the adoption of this Constitution, Christianity is not now a part of the common law of the land. Some of the most distinguished jurists of our nation have decidedly condemned this position. I quote a few opinions:

In 1820, Senator Frelinghuysen said in Congress: 'Long before the American Revolution, it was decided that the desecration of the Sabbath was an offense at common law, which all admit recognizes Christianity. The Sabbath is recognized, both by the statute and the common law, by the States which compose this Union, as a day upon which courts cannot sit, or civil process issue.' In 1811, in New York, in the case of the people against Ruggles, the charge being blasphemy against the person and character of Jesus Christ, Chancellor Kent said: 'The authorities show that blasphemy against God, and contumelious reproaches and profane ridicule of Christ or the Holy Scriptures, are offenses punishable at common law, whether uttered by words or writings.' Again: 'Though the Constitution has discarded religious establishments it does not forbid judicial cognizance of those offenses against religion and morality, which have no reference to any such establishment, or to any particular form of government, but are punishable because they strike at the root of moral obligation, and weaken the security of the social ties.' Again: 'Christianity, in its enlarged sense, as a religion revealed and taught in the Bible, is not unknown to our law.' In this decision all the Judges concurred. In 1824, in Pennsylvania, in the case of a trial for blasphemy against the Bible, the Court said that 'even if Christianity was not part of the law of the land, it is the popular religion of the country, an insult on which would be indictable as directly tending to disturb the public peace. Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been, part of the common law of Pennsylvania.' Again: 'It has long been firmly settled that blasphemy against the Deity generally, or an attack on

the Christian religion indirectly, for the purpose of exposing its doctrines to ridicule and contempt, is indictable and punishable as a temporal offense.'

In 1861, in New York, in the case of Lindenmuller, convicted under act of Assembly of giving dramatic representations on Sunday, the Supreme Court held 'that Christianity is part of the common law of this State in the qualified sense that is entitled to respect and protection as the acknowledged religion of the people.' The Court showed that in the Constitutional Convention of New York, held in 1821, 'the question was intelligently discussed and settled by our most eminent jurists, so as to make the interpretation of Chancellor Kent, in the case of the People against Ruggles, that the Christian religion was the law of the land, in the sense that it was preferred over all other religions, and entitled to the recognition and protection of the temporal courts as the common law of the land, the fixed meaning of the Constitution.'"

In view of all the facts, thus so ably presented; and in view of many others, such as the appointment by the government of Christian ministers as army and navy chaplains, the appointment of Christian ministers as chaplains for both houses of Congress, the payment of these chaplains out of the treasury of the nation, the appointment of thanksgiving and fast days, the observance of the Lord's day by Congress as a day of rest from their official duties, the administration of oaths by a solemn appeal to the God of the Christian Bible, the laws against the breaking of the Christian Sabbath, against profanity and blasphemy, against the disturbance of Christian assemblies engaged in religious worship, in view of all these facts, we say, this American Government, in and under the present Constitution, has ever, save perhaps in a few instances, borne unequivocal and decided testimony to the world that *Christianity*, and not Mohammedanism, or Judaism, or Mormonism, or Paganism, or Atheism, is the recognized religion of the land!

But, whilst the Government has thus, by repeated official acts, declared itself in favor of Christianity, it yet very wisely, we think, has refrained from incorporating any specific recog-

nition of it in the National Constitution. Recognizing the character and functions of the Constitution to be purely moral and civil, and not religious, it has, with commendable wisdom, avoided even the attempt to dictate, through it, a religious creed to the people.

And since both the people and the government of our land are thus in declared sympathy with Christianity, above any other form of religion, and this to such a degree as is not inconsistent with the genius of our republican form of government, and with that freedom of individual thought and creed accorded to every citizen, it is our opinion that all this modern clamor for a distinct utterance and recognition, not simply of Christianity, but of certain specific articles of Christian doctrine, is entirely *unnecessary*, and is a mere "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, and perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds."

5. The manifest injustice and wrong of such an amendment, to all whose religious creed differs from the creed thus recognized in it, is also an overwhelming argument against it. Such an amendment, as every one well knows, is an authoritative declaration, by the civil government, of a religious *creed*, or of a series of Christian doctrines, the rejection or non-confession of which will entail the loss of certain inestimable privileges and rights, now and forever justly belonging to every American citizen, irrespective of his religious opinions and faith. It will be the *State* entering that most sacred of all domains, the domain of conscience, the domain of religious liberty and freedom of religious thought and opinion, and compelling its citizens, under penalty of forfeiting their eligibility to certain political offices, under oath, to declare their acceptance and belief of the proposed religious dogmas. It is, in a word, an incipient step towards the introduction, here upon free American soil, of that poisonous tree of death to both the liberty and piety of so many other nations, viz., the union of Church and State. It is the un-American, and anti-republican, and tyrannical principle of the majority, imposing a religious creed upon a conscientiously

opposed minority, and then, by taxation, compelling that minority to support the government that thus imposes upon it that offensive creed. Can such a movement be just? Does it accord with the fundamental principles of our free institutions? Is it not, upon the very face of it, a gross wrong to all who could not hold and profess what it dictates? Would it not disqualify, for certain official positions, many of the most intelligent, influential, and patriotic of our citizens? Would it not falsify all our historic renown as a land in which freedom is the inestimable boon of every inhabitant? Would it not be a base inconsistency, after, for nearly a century, inviting men of every nationality and religious belief, or unbelief, to come here, and enjoy and advocate, equally with all others, whatever religious faith they may choose, now, after all this, to legislate, through the highest authority of the land, one creed for the acceptance of all? And would it not be an open contradiction to an already existing amendment of the national Constitution, which expressly declares (Article II) "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

No; the amendment, which is proposed would be a wrong, an act of injustice, to multitudes. In the language of Dr. Spear: "The *legal* effect of such an amendment would be to disqualify all persons who could not adopt the governmental confession of religious faith, to hold any office which requires them to declare by oath or affirmation that they will support the Constitution of the United States. Dissenters from this confession could not make the declaration without perjury or falsehood. The result would be that we must either abrogate the provision which requires the oath or affirmation, or virtually make a large number of American citizens, perfectly eligible on all other grounds, ineligible to office on *religious* grounds. We should put a religious test into the Constitution itself to which Atheists, Deists, Rationalists, and Jews could not subscribe; and this, unless they consented to become perjurers or liars, would exclude them from office, provided they were required to pledge themselves to the support of the Constitution. The exclusion would apply to nearly

all the offices, both state and national, known to the laws of this country. Going thus far, we might as well go still further, and say at once that no one shall be eligible to any office in the gift of the people who is not a professed believer in the Christian religion as taught in the Holy Scriptures. This, though wholly destructive of a democratic government, would give us formally a 'Christian' one in the persons who administer it. Are the gentlemen who composed the Pittsburg convention prepared to carry out their own proposition to its legitimate result? This is a question that deserves their serious consideration."

6. The dangerous precedent which the adoption of such an amendment would establish, is also a consideration which we do well to ponder. An amendment like this might easily, some day, under changed political circumstances, or changed public sentiment, be re-amended, or superseded by a totally different one. If to-day a specific form of Protestant Christianity is declared, through the Constitution, to be the religion of the land and which all must profess to believe who wish to enjoy the full privileges of American citizenship, possibly not many years hence, Romanism, or the religious system of Confucius, or Infidelity, or Deism, may be thus constitutionally recognized. The true friends of Protestant Christianity, should therefore, we think, for this reason, if for no other, give no sanction to any movement which will thus open the way to her enemies to inflict the most deadly blow upon her. They should remember that civil legislation in matters pertaining to religion, is like a sharp two-edged sword—it cuts *both* ways. And, thanking God for the preponderating and positive power and influence which, through its own moral efficiency, and without the formal aid of the State, Christianity has already acquired in our land, and is continuing to acquire, they should be satisfied, and should be heartily glad, to "let well enough alone."

7. The purely moral and spiritual character of our holy religion, and the spiritual nature of the weapons, with which, according to the Sacred Scriptures, she is to make her aggres-

sions upon the world, and gain for herself universal victory over both individuals and nations, also, we think, is in direct conflict with this proposed "constitutional religion." The Divine Master himself says, "My kingdom is not of this world;" and we read that when, upon one occasion, He "perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone." The apostle Paul, also, expressly declares that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds." And, again, he says: "Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we *persuade* men." And Christianity being thus, by the clearly expressed authority of the Divine Master himself, totally separate from all alliance with the State, and designed to perform its mission and accomplish its work of the world's conversion, independently of the State, it is a wrong to Christ himself, and a wrong to His divine religion, to attempt in any way to bind them together. The functions of the State are, we conceive, purely civil and political. They embrace control only of that which pertains to the highest welfare of the people, in their organic existence as a nation. They extend only to the *acts* of men, and not to their opinions and beliefs. The State is the proper instrument by which, for instance, "to establish justice insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

But the State, we hold, is utterly transcending its just and legitimate sphere when in any way, or to any extent, it assumes to prescribe and enforce any form of *religion* upon its subjects. It is usurpation, it is tyranny, it is despotism of the worst character, for the government, whether it be an autocracy, a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a republic, to bind, as a term or condition of full citizenship, the acknowledgment and profession of any religious creed, let it be what it will. Not by the State, but by the Church, are religious creeds to be formed. Not the will of the majority or multitude, but the will of God, as revealed in His inspired word, is the only just source of religious creeds. And not by compulsory laws,

not by arbitrary legislation, not by fines and penalties, not by "constitutional amendments," but simply, and only, by appeals to the better nature and reason of men, by moral influences brought to bear upon them from the word and sacraments, by the use faithfully of the spiritual yet mighty weapons given to the Church by its great divine Head; "by manifestation of the *truth*, commending it to every man's *conscience* in the sight of God;" by such persuasive and moral means only, should the attempt ever be made to bring men to accept a religious creed. Christianity itself, we think, enjoins this. And the page of history, red with human blood shed by the sword of religious persecution, thrillingly and impressively warns us against delegating to the State the dictation of men's religious beliefs, or the guardianship of their consciences. In the divine order of things, the State has its own distinct sphere—a sphere embracing man's earthly relations, rights, and duties. And Christianity has its own distinct sphere, viz., the higher sphere of man's purely spiritual nature, embracing conscience, will, affections, and all the obligations which, as a subject of the *Divine* government, he owes to God and to his fellow men. The State, therefore, we say, should keep within its own true sphere, and should ever confine itself to the exercise alone of those civil functions which belong to it. And so, also, whilst Christianity, like unseen leaven, should seek to permeate the State with its purifying and righteous influences, and should ever, by moral agencies, endeavor to imbue the policy and statesmanship of a land with its own elevating and blessed spirit, it should, nevertheless, ever jealously keep itself separate from, and untrammeled by, even the slightest formal union with the State. Scorning all resort to legislative or purely human aid, by which to secure the victory for itself over men's minds and hearts, it should ever proudly depend upon its own divine self, and should ever act with the lofty consciousness that in itself is lodged, by its Divine Author, an infinite fulness of power to work the works which God has given it to do. Thus should the things that are Cæsar's be rendered unto Cæsar, and the things that are God's, be rendered unto God.

By no constitutional amendment, and by no other attempted union of Church and State, should "the sons of God" and the daughters of men" be brought into an unhallowed alliance, lest there again be giants of sin in the earth, and the avenging wrath of Jehovah descend upon the nations. But ever, by the native power of God's own truth, revealed in His word, deposited in His Church, and carried home to men's hearts and consciences by the Holy Spirit, let Christianity wage her aggressive warfare, not only for the conversion of our American nation, but for the conversion, also, of the whole world. Her own pure and saving gospel *truth*, presented alone by moral means, is the only weapon she needs. By this alone, in the first centuries, she achieved her sublime conquests. By this alone, in the days of the Reformation, as unveiled and re-exhibited to the world by the immortal Luther, and his heroic coadjutors, she again went forth, with resistless power, conquering and to conquer. And to-day, God's finger writes anew the precious emblem of the Cross athwart the face of the heavens, and anew declares, "*in hoc signo vinces.*" The *truth* shall make the nations free! Blessed truth! The *truth* as it is in Christ Jesus! Let the Church only preach and live this truth! Let her only exhibit truly to the nation and to the world, as humanity's only Redeemer, this incarnate Son of God, who is the Way and the Truth and the Life, and soon even the heathen shall be given to Him for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession.

> "Truth only needs to be for once spoke out,
> And there's such music in her, and such rhythm
> As makes men's memories her joyous slaves,
> And clings around the soul as the sky clings
> Round the mute earth—forever beautiful."

ARTICLE IV.

UNION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

"*Voices for Union*," in our Lutheran Church, have become frequent and loud. Whether, indeed, they are all intelligent, judicious, and well directed, may admit of some doubt. It is not always the case, that where there is most clamor, most genuine feeling, wisdom, and judgment are to be found. Much of the cry about union among denominations, as well as that about union in the Lutheran Church, is very empty, or void of meaning and principle.

Still, these "voices" witness to a wide-spread feeling, that the present divided state of our Lutheran Church is not a desirable or satisfactory one. And, upon this point, there is little room for any diversity of sentiment. For, whatever practical difficulties there may be in the way of union, and however some may justify our divisions, on account of differences in doctrinal views, usages, language, or nationality, yet it must be confessed, that if we could all harmonize, and unitedly co-operate, in the great work assigned us, it would be far better, as well as far more consonant with Christian sentiment, both in and out of the Lutheran Church. Depth and earnestness of Christian feeling, never can be reconciled to such divisions, except as the less of two evils. The prayer of Christ, that His disciples might all be one, finds a response in every Christian heart, and divisions in the Church are submitted to, only as evils for which there is yet no adequate remedy, but which must await the developments of an overruling Providence, and the workings of grace.

Several things have combined to give additional force to the feeling in favor of union in the Lutheran Church. The movements of the Evangelical Alliance, in which members of different denominations unite, and the increasing fellowship

between different communions of Protestant Christians, cannot fail to start the question, if different denominations can thus unite to show their essential oneness, should not all who truly bear the Lutheran name, be able to do at least as much? The recent happy reunion of the Old and New School General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, after a separation of thirty years, has caused the pulse of Christian union to beat higher in the churches. The giant strides of Romanism and Infidelity, in these United States, must lead all thoughtful Christians to consider, what evangelical Christianity can do, to bring its united influence to bear in counteracting and overcoming the powers of darkness. The great work, which God has given us, as a Church, to do in this land, requires all our united wisdom and energies to accomplish. These, and other considerations, should dispose us to look at this subject, as one of no common interest.

We confess that we approach this discussion, not without some misgivings and serious apprehensions. The mind of the Church is not in the very best condition for such a discussion. The pulse is feverish and excited from recent controversies. Prejudice has not yet fully yielded to calm and sober reflection, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to write or read with entire impartiality. Our object is to write in the interest of union and fraternity, and yet it will not be surprising, if our well-meant efforts be misinterpreted, and what we write made the occasion for further controversy. Even our motives may be called in question, by those who may not be able to agree with our conclusions.

However, as the Review is intended to be open to the free and friendly discussion of such subjects, we will frankly present our views, and if any other can show "a more excellent way," the opportunity will be thus afforded. Truth has nothing to lose from honest discussion, and those, who are conscious of being in the right, need not fear such an ordeal. We must have interchange of views and opinions, before we can expect to reach harmony of purpose and action.

The various opinions about union, in our Church, so far as

they take any shape or form, may be reduced to a few leading views or theories. We may, at once discard the vague and indefinite feeling, that would cry—'let us all come together, and, ignoring all questions of doctrine and practice, let us unite in one body—let us agree to disregard all differences, and simply work together.' This simple and easy way, as it may seem to those who do not care to think, but who merge all considerations of truth and duty in mere feeling, will not commend itself to the sober reflecting part of the Church. Whatever is done must be done intelligently, with perfect candor and sincerity, and with due regard for conscientious convictions. A union, consummated by simply closing the eyes to the real difficulties of the case, instead of intelligently scanning them, even were it possible, would not be very commendable or hopeful. Honest convictions deserve and demand a more respectful treatment, and any proposed union that utterly disregards them, must fail to produce a true and lasting peace, or to furnish the basis of genuine fellowship and hearty co-operation. Christian men, understanding each other, may agree to disagree, and yet work harmoniously together: but they can hardly do so, by shutting their eyes, and attempting to proceed in the dark.

We have no disposition to magnify the differences existing in the Lutheran Chnrch. Many of them are utterly insignificant, and should present no bar to union. But, be they small or great, it is better to recognize their existence, and to act in view of them, than to seek to deny or conceal them.

The leading views, in regard to union in the Lutheran Church, may be embraced under three heads, and according to this arrangement, it is proposed now to consider them.

1. *That of radicalism or extreme liberalism.* This term is used to describe the position of those, who would have the Lutheran Church in the United States, to cut loose from all historical and doctrinal connection with the Lutheran Church of the past, to renounce all distinctive peculiarities of faith or worship, and to act as though the foundations were to be laid anew. And in laying anew the foundations and pro-

ceeding to build, we are not to be influenced or swayed by what the fathers have done. We are to act, substantially, as if there had been no Lutheran Church during the past three hundred years.

With such, the Confession of the Church, and the history of the Church, are to be treated as having no special importance or significance. They can make their own Confession, or, discarding everything that is distinctive, they would unite the Church on the broad basis of our common evangelical Christianity. The Augsburg Confession is supposed to be in the way of free development, and true union, and it must either be set aside, or mutilated to suit the views and purposes of those thus retaining it. A few articles, like those of the Apostles' Creed, or those adopted by the Evangelical Alliance, are all that are deemed necessary or desirable, whilst an equal or wider liberty, in matters of worship, is claimed, and on such a basis the union of the Church is to be effected.

This may not be a perfectly accurate presentation, and no portion of the Church, nor any class of individuals in the Church, may be willing to accept it as presenting their views. Nothing can be further from our intention, than to do injustice to any one, or to present any portion of the Church in a false light, and it is not necessary to insist on the perfect accuracy of this representation. It is, at least, near enough to a faithful portraiture to answer the purpose, and it is hoped that no one will consider it as doing injustice to any class or individuals. The sole object of the statement, is to present, in a fair and candid manner, what is understood to be the position of those, who advocate a union of the Church on such a basis of *extreme liberalism.*

That there is such an element in the Church, scarcely admits of any doubt, and need not be proved. It is somewhat difficult to define and designate, because those who are included, do not constitute any distinct body or organization, nor are they confined to any particular wing or section of the Church. They may be found even in Synods that profess the very op-

posite of such views. They are individuals, here and there, in different organizations; and while their numbers may not now be so great as some years ago, they are still believed to be sufficient to claim our attention, and to have a place in this discussion. Such an element has existed in the Lutheran Church, throughout most of her history, and has been more or less potent at different periods, and depending on different circumstances.

To such a union, or a union of Lutherans on such a basis, there are, we think, insuperable difficulties—at least for the present. However catholic and liberal, and even apostolic, it may at first sight appear, it will be found wanting, when put to the test of actual experiment. It has, indeed, been tried and proved a failure. Whatever the future may accomplish to break down denominational barriers, or to unite the whole Church of Christ in one common Confession, like that of apostolic or primitive Christianity, it must be confessed, that all efforts in this direction, among Protestant churches, have failed, and that we are not yet prepared for such a union. What the Church of the future shall be, we need not anticipate or attempt to prophesy.

For the sake of greater distinctness, some of the prominent objections to this view will be briefly presented.

For the Lutheran Church, in the United States, to attempt a union on this broad basis, would be to lose her denominational existence, and to become the common hunting ground of every sect in search of proselytes. For it is as certain as anything can be, that other churches, in love with their party distinctions, will not lay them aside. It would, in reality, be no union of Lutherans, but a renouncing of our Lutheranism, in the vain hope of establishing a broad church, or of uniting all evangelical denominations in one body. Something like this was attempted by Calixtus, in the seventeenth century, but with what success is well known. So far from furthering the cause of Christian union, it only furnished occasion for increased controversy and new divisions in the Church, involving Calixtus himself in unhappy and contin-

ued strife, embittering his very existence, until, as Mosheim says, "he passed from these scenes of discord to heavenly rest." It may be imagined that party spirit is less rife now, and that Christian denominations have grown more liberal toward each other; but we believe that similar efforts at the present day would meet with no better success. It is foolish not to heed the voice of history.

It would not, for various reasons, secure the favor of the great mass of Lutherans, and they could not be induced to give in their adhesion to any such a movement. They love their own Church. Its history, its doctrines, its usages, are dear to them. There is something even in a name, and they are not willing to abandon that without good reason. But genuine Lutheranism has more than a name. There are principles and doctrines which they are not willing to exchange for those of other denominations. They are unwilling to receive the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, or any extract of modern liberalism, for the Augsburg Confession. They cling to the good old Confession of 1530, and prefer it to any and every later improvement. There are usages, which long experience have rendered sacred, and proved to be most valuable.

And why, it may well be asked, should Lutherans be willing to sacrifice everything to please others, or to please some among themselves? Is it not acknowledged by all, competent to judge in such matters, that the Augsburg Confession is the most liberal and catholic of all our modern Confessions of Protestant Christianity, and has in it the least that savors of sectarianism? If any of our Protestant Confessions shall ever become the common Confession, and bond of union, among Protestant denominations, it must be the venerable Confession of Augsburg. To throw away or abandon it, would be to throw away one of the best hopes for a united Lutheran Church, and a united Protestant Christianity. It is strange indeed, how blind even many Lutherans are to the superior excellence of the Augsburg Confession, as compared with the Confessions of other denominations. And what is there in the worship of other churches, so superior to that of

genuine Lutheranism, alike removed from the extremes of ritualistic formalism, and a lawless individualism?

It would be disregarding the hand of God in His Church. The Reformation was the work of God. This no Protestant Christian will deny. The means employed and the results accomplished, stamp its divine authorship. Whilst we may not consider the instruments employed, or their work, as free from all imperfection or error, we dare not cast the whole aside as useless, or worse than useless. The new life, that began to flow on in the Lutheran Church, cannot be suddenly stopped, or so completely turned aside, as to flow in an entirely different channel. We may indeed remove obstacles, that hinder its free and full development, but we must not seek to destroy, by attempting to ignore the past, and to begin a new life in the present. It may be ours to modify, but not to begin. We live under the influence of the past, and transmit our influence onward into the future. The Church, as well as individuals, has a life, and if we would live in history, as a church, we must not be untrue to our church, or the hand of God moulding and shaping her life in history. If it be true of nations, that "God hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation," much more does He guide and mould the Church, "which He hath purchased with His own blood," and for which kingdoms and nations rise and fall. Even Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. Development, progress, improvement, may characterize the onward march of the Church. We believe in progress. The Church of the nineteenth century is not to be bound by everything of the sixteenth, any more than the sixteenth was bound by the twelfth. But we cannot ignore the past, and begin anew, without rejecting what God has so manifestly wrought.

This would be to give encouragement and sanction to the enemies of the Reformation. They are fond of repeating the "failure of Protestantism," and alleging that the Reformation is a broken bone badly set. And here, as is very often the case, extremes would meet. Those who persuade themselves that they are the very furthest removed from Romanism,

join hands with the friends of Rome, to depreciate and denounce the character of the great Reformation, and persuade themselves that we need something new and different. The Church of Rome has no better allies than those, who are continually making war on the Reformation of the sixteenth century; and although she may not acknowledge them as belonging to her camp, yet she knows very well how to turn their influence to good account. If there be any one point about which Protestant Christians, and especially those who bear the Lutheran name, should be fully persuaded, it is of the essential soundness and truly evangelical character of the Reformation, wrought by God, through the instrumentality of Luther and his co-laborers. It was the revival and restoration of true, evangelical Christianity, and to which, under God, we are indebted for the richest blessings of the present age. To speak lightly of it, is to dishonor God, and to deride it, is to revile the work of the Holy Ghost.

We feel assured, that if ever the Lutheran Church in this country, is to become a great and mighty Church—a power and a praise in the land—it will not be by selling her birthright, but by holding fast to her inheritance, and developing her own true life. There is no need of laying another foundation. We should go on to build, only seeing to it, that we build wisely and securely. This will not hinder the removal of any rubbish that centuries may have gathered about the building, or the greatest care that the structure may be free from every incongruity and blemish; but it will forbid the rash and hostile cry of "*rase it, rase it, even to the foundations thereof.*"

The good intentions of those, who thus desire a thorough reformation of *the Reformation*—a change so radical that it may be called a revolution—we do not mean to call in question. They may be animated by an earnest zeal for, what they deem to be, the glory of God and the salvation of men. They may imagine that they are simply following the teaching of the divine word, and the leadings of the Holy Spirit. But whilst giving them full credit for sincerity of heart and honesty of purpose, we cannot believe that their's is an en-

lightened zeal; or that their wisdom is that inspired by the experience of the past, or the careful and humble study of the word of God. We have an abiding conviction that the Reformers were guided from on high, and that their work must not be compared to "a cake not turned." We distrust the superior wisdom of those, who think that they can afford to dispense with the result of past labors, and to begin afresh for themselves. We do not advocate a slavish adherence to all the views and methods of the Reformers, or oppose all genuine progress and improvement in the Church; but we can just as little throw discredit on the grandest movement of modern times, and act as if all wisdom centered in us. There may be a superstitious reverence for the past, and an undue homage to the traditions of the fathers; but there may be, also, a presumptuous self-confidence, and an idolatrous worship of "the spirit of the times." Such, we fear, is the *radicalism* that some would substitute for genuine Lutheranism, and upon which, the hope of establishing a united and prosperous church, is, and must be, vain.

II. *That of extreme symbolism.* This term is used, not in any offensive sense, but simply to express the views and position of those, who insist, as a condition of union, on a rigid adherence to everything in the Symbolical Books. This we understand to be, substantially, the position of the Missouri, Ohio, and some other Synods, and especially, that of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. It will not be deemed invidious or unkind, if we single out this last mentioned body as the representative of this view. And this we do for two reasons. First, because it is the only body, in this country, professing such views, that has formally aimed at a general union among Lutherans, unless, perhaps, the recent movement of the Missouri, Ohio, and other Synods, is to be regarded in the same light. And, secondly, because we have a more definite statement of its doctrinal position, than we have of any other bodies with similar views and tendencies.

That no possible injustice may be done, the General Council will be allowed to speak for itself.

Article IV of "Principles of Faith and Church Polity," reads as follows: "That Confessions may be such a testimony of Unity, and bond of Union, they must be accepted *in every statement of doctrine, in their own true, native, original, and only sense.* Those who set them forth and subscribe them, *must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense.*"

Article VIII. declares of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, "We accept its statements of truth as in *perfect accordance* with the Canonical Scriptures."

Article IX. declares of "the other Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," that they are "all * * with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in the *perfect harmony* of one and the same scriptural faith."

No Synod can be received into the General Council, no matter how evangelical and orthodox, and even thoroughly Lutheran, it may be, without adopting or endorsing these "Principles of Faith," which are declared to be "*Fundamental and Unchangeable.*"

We have italicised a few clauses, to invite special attention to them. We are aware, that attempts have been made to explain away the rigidness of this adherence to all the Symbolical Books, and to "every statement of doctrine" which they contain. The fair meaning of words have been softened down, to make them less unpalatable to those who do not relish such strong meat. It has been alleged, that a subscription to the Augsburg Confession is all that is demanded, and in confirmation of this, Article VI. has been cited. But if there was any room to doubt the meaning of these "Fundamental Principles," the last official utterance of the General Council, on this very subject, given forth at Lancaster, Ohio, November, 1870, should be considered as decisive, and removing all ground of controversy. In reply to the questions from the Minnesota Synod, the General Council responds, (printed Minutes, p. 35):

"There can be no reasonable question with regard to the unreserved official adherence of the General Council to the *entire faith* of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as confessed

in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, AND FURTHER DEFINED AND DEFENDED IN THE OTHER RECOGNIZED SYMBOLS OF OUR CHURCH. THE CONFESSIONS *never have been, and never can be, more explicitly and heartily acknowledged, as statements of pure doctrine, than the General Council has acknowledged and does acknowledge them.*"

Unless words are used to conceal the meaning, this language binds the General Council to "every statement of doctrine" in these Symbolical Books. And this is declared to be necessary as "a testimony of Unity and bond of Union." It is not simply the Augsburg Confession, but, along with it, "*the other Confessions*," or the "*entire faith*" as "*further defined and defended in the other recognized Symbols of our Church.*" These, in the judgment of the General Council, if they do not include more, cannot include less, than "the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord." ("Principles of Faith, Art. IX.)"

This position we have designated by the term of "*extreme symbolism*," to mark its unreserved, unqualified adherence to "every statement of doctrine" in the Symbolical Books, and its insisting upon this, as a principle "fundamental" to the union of the Lutheran Church. We agree, that, so far as we know, "the Confessions never have been, and never can be, more explicitly and heartily acknowledged." It is carrying the matter of Symbolism, or subscription to human creeds, to the utmost extreme. It is binding the faith of the Church to a human instrumentality, claimed to be infallible, and decreed to be "*unchangeable.*"

To such a plan, or basis of union, there are many and grave objections. We must be frank enough to say, that we know of nothing to commend it. In our eyes, it has not a single redeeming feature, or one that can command the assent of our judgment or the approval of our conscience. It is impracticable, un-Lutheran, unscriptural, and opposed to Christian freedom and Christian integrity. It is a burden to tender consciences, and a snare to unsuspecting Christians. If we write earnestly, it is because our whole nature revolts and

protests against such a yoke of bondage, under the name of evangelical Lutheran.

Wherever and whenever this "*extreme symbolism*" has been tried, it has proved destructive of the harmony and prosperity of the Church. The first serious attempt, of something like it, was on the completion and publication of the entire Book of Concord, in 1580. The design was to establish a church, that would be deemed genuinely Lutheran, and that would be united and knit together by accepting and confessing the "entire faith" as defined and defended in these, so called, symbols of the Church. Different opinions, we know, have been entertained as to the result of this experiment, and our judgments are likely to be influenced by our previous views. But we may accept the testimony of the learned and candid Mosheim, an intelligent and devoted Lutheran. He says of the Formula of Concord: "The book which was to have restored harmony among Lutherans, and which actually did so in many places, furnished also new ground for discord. * *

"Even among the Lutherans themselves, some of the most distinguished churches could not be persuaded, either by entreaties or arguments, to receive the Formula, and to add it to their guides of doctrinal instruction. * *

"In Saxony itself, not a few detested in their hearts, that Formula which they had subscribed with their hands; holding fast the doctrines which they had received from Melanchthon and his friends."*

Thus, its first introduction was at the sacrifice of harmony, Christian liberty, and integrity. As to its practical effect in preserving the Lutheran Church in the true faith, we have a most instructive lesson. "In the year 1580, at the time of the publication of the Formula, there were but two churches in Germany, that had positively declared themselves for the Calvinistic doctrine on the Lord's Supper. * * At the close of the century, however, and therefore within the next twenty or thirty years, perhaps fully one-fourth of all the

---

*Church History, Vol. III., pp. 155—157.

Protestant churches in the empire had given in their full adhesion to this party."*

Such were the effects of this system of rigid Symbolism, on its first introduction, three hundred years ago. We need not follow its history through all the intervening time. It would be very foolish to deny, that there have been many active, zealous Christians, who have been reared, and who lived under such influences. Such there no doubt are at the present day. But their Christian character is not due to these influences, but to the grace of Christ, which is wider and mightier than all our systems. They are what they are, "by the grace of God."

The recent attempts to revive an "*extreme Symbolism*" in the United States, and by this means to unite the Lutheran Church, have not, thus far, been very successful. Missouri and Ohio seem as averse to a union with the General Council, as the General Council is to a union with the General Synod. There are Synods and parties, professedly holding to "every statement of doctrine," yet no nearer to each other than different denominations. And even in the General Council, it may not be illiberal or uncandid to say, there is such diversity of views on "the four points," and some others besides, as to make the pretence of understanding everything "in one and the same sense," as more like a burlesque, than a grave declaration of sober, Christian men.

The experience of the past ought to suffice, but men are slow to learn from experience, and the lessons are soon forgotten. History, in the Church, as well as in the world, is continually repeating itself. We must have another experiment of "extreme Symbolism." In the meantime, and without waiting for the result, we have other and serious objections, besides its impracticability.

It is essentially *un-Lutheran*, in its confession of faith. Instead of being broad and catholic, as genuine Lutheranism

---

*Article by the Rev. Dr. B. Sadtler, translated from Dr. Plank, *Ev. Review*, January, 1851.

is, it is narrow, exclusive, and sectarian. It seeks to make binding what the Lutheran Church, as a whole, has never received. It puts into the faith to be accepted and maintained, and as "defined and defended" in these Symbols, what has no claim upon genuine Lutherans. It treats the Augsburg Confession as Rome treats the Bible—denying its sufficiency as a Confession of faith, and supplementing its teaching by tradition and the interpretation of the Church. To confirm and illustrate this declaration, of putting into the faith what does not belong to it, we select a single "statement of doctrine," as "defined and defended" in the Formula of Concord; and cite an authority on the subject that the General Council will not dispute. The statement of doctrine selected, is the oral manducation of the body and blood of Christ, in the Lord's Supper, or that the body and blood are received "*orally or with the mouth.*"*

On this point, the Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth, now President of the General Council, says: "It is true, that the Formula of Concord, which appeared thirty-four years after Luther's death, does use and defend the term." But as to the question, whether "the Lutheran Church as whole," receives this statement thus "defined and defended" in the Formula of Concord, he is constrained to declare, in capitals, "SHE DOES NOT." He admits that it is not in "THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, the only distinctive symbol universally recognized in the Lutheran Church," and that "entire national bodies of Lutherans have existed for centuries, and now exist, who have no snch expression in their Confessions," (Ev. Review, July, 1867). And yet, the "Principles of Faith" of the Gen-

---

*"Altera vero manducatio corporis Christi est *sacramentalis*, et ore fit, quando in sacra Coena verum et substantiale corpus et sanguis Christi ore accipiuntur atque participantur ab omnibus, qui panem illum benedictum et vinum in Cœna dominica edunt et bibunt."

"Das andere Essen des Leibes Christi ist mündlich oder sacramentlich, da in heilegen Abendmahl der wahre, wesentliche Leib und Blut Christi von allen, die das gesegnete Brod und Wein im Abendmahl essen und trinken * * auch mündlich empfangen und genossen wird."—*Formula of Concord*, Art. VII.

eral Council make binding this statement of doctrine, rejected by "entire national bodies of Lutherans for centuries," and claim that to do so is fundamental to genuine Lutheranism.

This is only one doctrine, or "statement of doctrine," to be found in the Formula of Concord, and other Symbolical Books, not contained in the Augsburg Confession. We might adduce many others, but we forbear. It should be enough simply to ask the question, can there be any hope of uniting the Lutheran Church in America, on such a basis, as whole national bodies of Lutherans, and whose Lutheranism has never been called in question, have refused for centuries to acknowledge or adopt?

Just as little claim has this "*extreme Symbolism*" to be considered true *historic Lutheranism.* It does not date back to the time when the great Confession of the Lutheran Church was given to the world, and when she took her place in the van of Protestantism. It was half a century later, when Luther and Melanchthon were both in their graves—the former having been dead more than a third of a century—that this system was wrought out, and forced upon part of an unwilling Church. This type of Lutheranism was unknown to Luther and Melanchthon, and never could have received their endorsement. It is wholly foreign to their spirit, to bind such a system upon the consciences of those, whom the gospel has enlightened and made free. Melanchthon's liberal tendencies are well known, and even Luther, though less compromising, utterly refused to allow himself to be drawn to any such extreme, or to join a mere party in the Church. He could not be induced to break with Melanchthon, or to yield to those who sought to gain him to their side. He remained firm in his adherence to a broader and more liberal Lutheranism. Dr. J. H. Kurtz, a decided symbolist, makes the following candid statement. "Soon after the adoption of the Confession at Augsburg, two tendencies, which gradually separated more widely, began to develop themselves in the Lutheran Church. The one party, headed by *Melanchthon*, endeavored to widen the platform, on which Catholics on the one hand, and Reformed on the other, might stand, and thus

effect an approximation to union and harmony. The other party, led by AMSDORF, FLACIUS, and WIGAND, strove rather to define the pure Lutheran system with all possible strictness, so as to guard it against any admixtnre with Catholicising or Calvinistic elements. *Luther attached himself to neither party, but endeavored to keep both from plunging into their respective extremes, and, as far as possible, to maintain peace between both.*"* No one, in the least acquainted with the subject, will attempt to maintain, that, during the life time of Luther, any such *extreme Symbolism* found, or could have found, general favor. Even the Augsburg Confession was acknowledged less formally and rigidly than it has been in later times. Müller states, that while at that time it was regarded as a "general Confession," it was by no means considered "Symbolical" in our sense of the term. The very same treatment of the Augsburg Confession, awarded it by Luther and Melanchthon, would now bring down the severest denunciations of those who claim that they are the only true Lutherans, and alone entitled to bear the name.

As a post-reformation Lutheranism, this "*extreme Symbolism*" sought to supplant the more catholic and conservative Lutheranism of the Reformers, and, to a certain extent, succeeded; but it has never flowed on, uninterruptedly and harmoniously, in the great swelling tide of historic Lutheranism. It has only manifested itself in particular countries, and at particular periods, but has never been the generally received and acknowledged Lutheranism of the Church. The Synod of Pennsylvania, as late as 1853, by a formal and decisive vote, refused to endorse even an approximation to this "*extreme Symbolism.*" But those were the days of Bætis, Baker, Demme, Richards, and such men.

Such a Lutheranism we hold to be *unscriptural.* It is not, indeed, pretended that the Scriptures give any specific directions about Creeds or Confessions. This is a matter left to the liberty of the Church, and to be determined by the expediency or necessity of the case. But whilst the Church has

---

*Church History. Vol. II., pp. 132, 133.

a perfect right to adopt a Confession, and some Confession may be an imperative necessity, no church has a right to adopt any Confession contravening the great principles of New Testament Christianity. To impose terms of communion, or of ministerial fellowship, antagonistic to the spirit of Christ and his religion, is a bold invasion of divine authority, and an infringement of the inalienable rights of the people of God. It will hardly be denied that one of these leading fundamental principles of New Testament Christianity, is the essential oneness of true believers in Jesus Christ; and that whatever tends to create or maintain needless divisions in the Church, is in so far unscriptural and unchristian. In this spirit, the Confessors, at Augsburg, said: "We did not feel willing to place in the greatest and most imminent danger, before God, our own souls and consciences, by the abuse of the Divine Name and Word, or to transmit to our children and descendants, and entail upon them, any other doctrine than that of the pure Divine Word and Christian truth, as these doctrines are clearly taught in the holy Scriptures, and besides are neither contrary nor in opposition to the universal Christian, or even the Roman, Church, so far as may be observed from the writings of the Fathers.." (Aug. Conf. Art. XXI.) The Confessors then held it to be "contrary to all Christian unity and love, without any authority of divine command, or of Scripture," to exclude them from ecclesiastical fellowship: and, on the same principles, we hold it to be unscriptural now to set up an unauthorized standard, that would exclude millions of Lutherans from the Lutheran fold.

It is *opposed to Christian freedom and Christian integrity.* We may be told that this cannot be, since no one is compelled to belong to such a body, or to subscribe to such principles. Very true, and this is a simple and summary way of settling the question. That is, if an individual is willing, for the sake of his conscience, to be kept out, or thrust out, of the Church of his fathers, or of his choice, he is not compelled to come in and submit to such oppression. He can choose between his conscience, and the surrender of his freedom and his integrity—a privilege not always allowed by

ecclesiastical tyrants and persecutors. It is a liberty, about equal to that so pointedly presented by Sydney Smith, in his scathing review of the "*Persecuting Bishops*," where he speaks of the poor "curate," who "has the heart of a gentleman, and the spirit of a Christian, and the kindness of a pastor; and this man, though he has exercised the duties of a clergyman for twenty years—though he has most ample testimonies of conduct, from clergymen as respectable as any bishop—though an archbishop add his name to the list of witnesses, is not good enough for, * * but is pushed out in the street, with his wife and children, and his little furniture, to surrender his honor, his faith, his conscience, and his learning—or to starve." The "Persecuting Bishop" maintained that it was a voluntary matter to answer his questions to his satisfaction—and so it was. The principle involved in both cases, is the same—that of setting up unusual, unauthorized, and oppressive tests, and then coolly saying, that if any are not pleased with them, they need not subscribe, they can stay out of their Church, or out of their ministry.

And now, lest it might be imagined that it is only the factious, or those who have no good claim to the name of Lutherans, that are opposed to this "*extreme Symbolism*," allow us to cite a case or two that ought to command some respect and consideration. In 1821, Rev. Dr. Endress, pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Lancaster, Pa., and one of the most distinguished members of the Synod of Pennsylvania, wrote concerning the Formula of Concord: "*I would suffer both my hands to be burned off before I would subscribe that instrument.*" It is on record that the Landgrave of Hesse, whose father was one of the original signers of the Augsburg Confession, used similar language. When urged to accept the Formula of Concord, he replied, "*that he would rather thrust his hand into the fire, than sign the Book with it, if all its present contents were to remain in it*," and added, that "*the gray hairs were making their appearance, therefore he could not now learn a new faith, but must abide by the Augsburg Confession.*" Just so, thousands of Lutherans feel now. However they may prize the Formula of Concord, as a most valuable theological pro-

duction, and may agree with most of its doctrines, there are some things in it which they never can be brought to subscribe. They prize too highly their liberty and their conscience ever to submit to such a yoke.

And now, without arraying any more objections against this theory, of binding the Church of the nineteenth century by the stereotyped, "unchangeable" system of the sixteenth, admitting of neither development nor improvement, we close this part of the discussion by citing the words of a very recent publication of acknowledged ability. "There is not a single religious party which does not feel the need either of confirmation or of transformation. All the churches born of the great movement of the sixteenth century, are passing through a time of crisis. They are all asking themselves, though from various stand-points, whether the Reformation does not need to be continued and developed. Aspiration toward the Church of the future, is becoming more general, more ardent. *But for all who admit the Divine origin of Christianity, the Church of the future has its type and ideal in that great past which goes back not three, but eighteen centuries.*"*

III. *That of conservative Lutheranism.* As this term, not likely to be very popular with extremists of either side, may need some explanation, we will endeavor to define and point out more clearly, the sense in which it is here employed.

By *conservative Lutheranism*, then, we mean a Lutheranism removed from, and intermediate between, the extremes of *radicalism* and *symbolism ;* that holds fast to the Augsburg Confession, and the great doctrines on which the Reformation hinged ; that in the reception of the Augsburg Confession leaves room for proper Christian liberty and such honest differences of opinion, as do not affect the essential or fundamental truths of the Confession ; that retains what is good and well approved in forms, and ceremonies, and usages, with full liberty to modify and improve, as circumstances and the continued study of God's word may direct ; that admits of

*The Early Years of Christianity, by E. De Pressensé, D. D.

development and improvement, based on the divine word, and in harmony with the growth and development of "the holy catholic Church."

This brief statement may be somewhat elucidated, when we add that the *extremes* have been discussed, and the conviction expressed that neither of them offers a practicable or safe basis for union in our Church. The one offers us too little as Lutherans, the other demands of us too much as Christians. We select an intermediate ground, not simply because it is intermediate or because such a position avoids certain difficulties and dangers, but because our firmest and deepest convictions lead us to such a choice. The Augsburg Confession cannot be surrendered, without surrendering the very name of Lutheran, and yet differences of opinion have always been tolerated under it. If any are unwilling to be mustered under such colors, they must take rank somewhere else than among conservative Lutherans. The whole subject of ceremonies and usages, of liturgical services and forms of worship, is left within the sphere of intelligent, Christian judgment, and should be disposed of, not by an arbitrary individualism, but by an enlightened church sentiment. The desire, on the part of some, to get rid of all the old, establised usages of the Church, and to substitute, in their stead, the ever changing practices of individual fancy, or the many colored usages of other denominations; and on the part of others, to retain everything that Luther, in a wise discretion, chose to retain three hundred years ago, does not belong to conservative Lutheranism. It seeks to combine the old and the new, and to preserve the spirit without a slavish adherence to the form or the letter.

And now, in advocacy of such a *conservative Lutheranism*, as the basis of union for the Lutheran Church in America, we have various and, we think, weighty considerations to offer. Our space will not allow the bringing forward of every argument, and will constrain to the study of brevity in the presentation of such as will be mentioned.

It is in harmony with the spirit of primitive, original Lutherism. It is well known that the signers of the Augsburg

Confession were not entirely agreed among themselves on all points of doctrine, and not even on the very points that have been the subjects of difference of opinion ever since. They subscribed with the understanding of liberty in their interpretation of it. This liberty was exercised by Melanchthon, even to the extent of altering the Confession, so as to make it better express the different views then prevailing, or to be more acceptable to different parties. This altered Augsburg Confession was so well and so generally received, that for many years scarcely any other was known. And this, be it remembered, in the very life time of Luther. It was not then used in the sense of a Confession so rigidly binding, that its reception, "in every statement of doctrine," was deemed essential to the very name of Lutheran; but as a free Christian Confession containing "*about the substance of the doctrine which is preached and taught in our churches, for the due instruction, Christian edification, peace of conscience, and improvement of believers.*" (Aug. Conf., Art. XXI.) This one plain, stubborn fact must forever stand in the way of those who, under the pretence of being the only genuine Lutherans, seek to make binding, "in every statement of doctrine," the Symbolical Books—that they are acting directly contrary to the example of Luther and Melanchthon, and the Church of their times. If there be anything so weighty in the authority and example of these illustrious Reformers, or of the Lutheran Church of their day, we claim that it is all on the side of a liberal, conservative Lutheranism, and against both the extremes to which it is opposed. We challenge any valid historical proof to the contrary. They resisted the fanaticism and false liberty of their day; and the "extreme Symbolism," which now arrogates to itself the sole honors of Lutheranism, had no veritable existence. They are both alike spurious productions. We maintain for *conservative Lutheranism* the honor of being the primitive Lutheranism of Luther and Melanchthon, and of the Confessors at Augsburg. Nor have we the remotest idea of being frightened out of our proprieties, by the continued cry of those who think to gain some-

thing for themselves by calling our Lutheranism in question. We claim the use of the Lutheran name by the most valid right—retaining its primitive Confession, and maintaining its free, tolerant spirit.

In the matter of forms, ceremonies, and usages, the Church at that early day inculcated and exercised a wide range of liberty. The Augsburg Confession expressly teaches that "it is not necessary that uniform ceremonies should be everywhere observed." The same view is reiterated, and the statement of it amplified, in the Apology. Melanchthon, again and again, maintained the liberty of the Church in this respect, and that none of its forms or ceremonies are to be considered as "*necessary or unalterable.*" Some things retained in the Church, at the time the Augsburg Confession was adopted, were very soon abandoned, and others gradually ceased to be observed. The very same reasons that influenced the Reformers in retaining some of the ancient usages in the Church at that day—the desire not needlessly to give offence—would influence us now, in the exercise of the same freedom, to omit them. The attempt to carry us back, or keep us back, to the forms and ceremonies practiced three hundred years ago, finds no sanction or authority in the spirit of primitive Lutheranism.

It does violence to no one's individual convictions of truth. For, whilst it does not impose on all one rigid system of doctrine, and thus burden the conscience, it leaves each one to believe as much more of the Symbolical Books as he chooses. If any want to go beyond the essential or fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and believe everything taught by Luther and Melanchthon, they can do so, only they must not insist on making their faith a rule for all other Lutherans. Beyond the fundamental doctrines, it allows a wide liberty to believe more or less of what has been received at some times and in some places. It aims at soundness of faith and Christian freedom united in one consistent system, and is unwilling to sacrifice the one or the other. On this basis, the most liberal *conservative Lutheran* and the *most Symbolic Lutheran* can unite, provided only that they respect each others

convictions and rights. Luther and Melanchthon lived and labored harmoniously in the same Church, and we do not desire to have a Lutheran Church that would exclude either. Either of them are quite good enough and Lutheran enough for us. Professing to build on the foundation they helped to lay, we would not exclude either of them from the building. And it seems to us that if any Lutheran feels his conscience burdened, or violence done to his convictions by such a position, it must be that he is not allowed the distinguished privilege of imposing his own particular views on his fellow Lutherans without their consent. We cannot understand that there is any principle of conscience or of religious duty that is violated by such a system. We can understand that it affords very little encouragement to bigotry or intolerance, and this is one of the very arguments in its favor. We plead, not for a licentious freedom, but for Christian freedom, and God helping us, we will continue to plead, with what little ability we can, while life and strength last.

It has the suffrage of the very best authorities, on the subject, in the Lutheran Church. We do not mean that they have advocated, in form, this view, but that their position is in favor of a moderate, conservative Lutheranism, as over against a rigid, Symbolical Lutheranism. The rigid, unqualified subscription and adherence to everything in the Symbolical Books, finds few supporters among acknowledged authorities. We believe that we might justly cite the language of the Symbolical Books themselves in favor of a less rigid subscription, and a more liberal interpretation. Not only does the Augsburg Confession speak of "about the substance of the doctrine," but the Preface to the Formula of Concord also states, that these "writings, viz., Confession of Augsburg, the Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, and the Smaller and Larger Catechisms of Luther, contain the sum or substance of our Christian doctrine." Even this sounds more liberal than some statements, we have quoted, of the present age.

Müller, in the preface to his valuable edition of the Symbolical Books, thus presents what he considers as the Church view. "The Church, then, does not wish to ascribe to her

Symbols immutable authority; she admits that some one might discover a defect in them; she finds them merely a temporary expression of her faith; she reserves to herself expressly the privilege of improving them, of completing, or of extending, as occasional necessity may require." New Market Edition, p. 16.

Buddeus argues against extremes. He says: "As to the authority of Symbolical Books, two extremes ought to be carefully avoided: the one is that of those who entirely condemn and reject them; the other, that of those who attribute more to them than is proper." * * "And thus they consult most correctly for themselves and for the Church, who pursuing a middle course, attribute to the Symbolical Books neither more nor less than is proper." Whilst maintaining the soundness of the Confessions on all doctrinal questions, he freely admits their errors or blemishes in minor matters, and cautions that "particular care must be taken, lest, in demanding the adherence of others to these formulas, we sin by too great rigor, especially if it be exacted on questions not belonging to the foundation of faith."*

Walch fully concurs in this view, and maintains that we err "if we require assent to what is not fundamental" in the Symbolical Books.†

Reinhard is quoted by Dr. C. F. Schaeffer as declaring "it to be a self-evident truth, steadfastly maintained by the most

---

*Isagoge: "Ad auctoritatem librorum symbolicorum quod adtinet, duo sollicite evitanda sunt extrema; quorum alterum illorum est, qui eos plane damnant, rejiciuntque, alterum illorum, qui plus, quam decet, illis tribuunt." pp. 528, 529.

Rectissime itaque sibi, et ecclesiæ, consulunt, qui, media via incedentes, nec plus, nec minus, quam decet, libris symbolicis tribunt." p. 531.

Cumprimis etiam cavendum, ne in sententiis aliorum ad hasce formulas exigendis. nimio peccemus rigore, præsertim si de quæstionibus ad fundamentum fidei non spectantibus." pp. 533, 534.

†Introductio in Libros Symbolicos * * "peccatur, quando libri symbolici in instrumentum dominandi atque alios in suspicionem hæreseos deducendi atque opprimendi convertuntur. Fieri id solet prinuom, si consensus cum illis in rebus secundariis, quæ non ad fundamentum fidei, etc." p. 960.

conscientious theologians, such as Spener, Walch, etc., that even he who has solemnly adopted and subscribed the Symbolical Books, is by no means bound to adopt every non-essential point." (*Ev. Review*, Vol. I, 471.)

These may suffice as a specimen of Lutheran authorities on this point, and they serve to show that we are advocating no new view, when we argue in favor of this basis of Lutheranism.

It is in harmony with early Christianity, and with the views and practices of the most conservative orthodox Churches at the present day. That in the early Church, there was no attempt to bind believers or ministers to a minute system of doctrine, including explanations of doctrines, is so well known and generally admitted, that we need not adduce the proof. For several centuries the Confessions were short, and limited to the fundamental facts or doctrines of the Christian system. And that on non-fundamental points there was as much diversity in the views of distinguished fathers, as there is now in the views of orthodox ministers in different denominations, cannot be denied. They freely tolerated such diversity in unity, and never dreamed of excluding and denouncing each other as heretics for such differences.

At the present day, we find this liberty theoretically maintained and practically illustrated in other Churches. We may cite the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches in confirmation. On the original Articles of the Episcopal Church, Burnet makes the following comment: "Thus was the doctrine of the Church cast into a short and plain form; in which they took care both to establish the positive articles of religion, and to cut off the errors formerly introduced in the time of popery, or of late broached by the Anabaptists and enthusiasts of Germany: *avoiding the niceties of schoolmen, or the peremptoriness of the writers of controversy; leaving, in matters that are more justly controvertible, a liberty to divines to follow their private opinions, without thereby disturbing the peace of the Church.*"*

---

*Burnet's History of the Reformation, Vol. II., 268.

That, on some points, these Articles have been differently interpreted, is a matter that is known to all. And this liberty of interpretation has been maintained by the greatest divines of the Episcopal Church. Indeed no other view has any claim to be considered as historical. The quaint Fuller says: "These holy men were loath to unchurch any, and drive them off from an ecclesiastical communion, for such petty differences, which made them pen the Articles in comprehensive words, to take in all, who differing in the branches, meet in the root of the same religion." Bishop Sherlock says: "The Church has left a latitude of sense to prevent schism and breaches upon every different opinion. It is evident the Church of England has so done in some articles, which are most liable to the hottest disputes; which yet are penned with that temper as to be willingly subscribed by men of different apprehensions in those matters." Bishop Horsley, so stout a defender of orthodoxy, not only advocates the right of this liberty, under the Articles, but in reference to a particular point, on which some deemed one interpretation as necessary, he maintained the equal right of the very opposite, and in affirming the liberty of either or both, says: "I assert, what I often have before asserted, and by God's grace I will persist in the assertion to my dying day."

The Presbyterian Church is usually regarded at one of the strictest, in matters of faith, among our Protestant denominations. And yet, in adopting the Westminster Confession and Catechism, in 1729, it is "as being in all THE ESSENTIAL AND NECESSARY ARTICLES, *good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine.*" After and during the separation in the Church, the Old School was regarded as the stricter of the two branches, and the defender of the most rigid orthodoxy according to the standards, and yet Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, said in the Princeton Review, of the Old School Presbyterian Church, it "*could not hold together a week, if we made the adoption of all its* [Westminster Confession] *propositions a condition of ministerial fellowship.*" Earlier he had said in the Review, in regard to the Westminster Confession, "When adopted by the Presbyterian Church in this country, it was

with the distinct understanding that the mode of subscription did not imply strict conformity of views."

Much more testimony of the same kind might be adduced, but we have not room. It may be safely affirmed that the position which we advocate, of conservative Lutheranism, is in harmony with the position of the most respectable and conservative Churches of modern times; and that not a single denomination, as such, maintains the position of "extreme Symbolism," or the acceptance of everything in its Confession, and to be understood exactly alike, as a condition of ministerial fellowship. All Churches unite in acknowledging the Apostles' Creed, and yet what is the fixed interpretation of the Article, "*He descended into hell?*" Do the ministers of any one denomination all understand it in the same sense? And if difference is freely allowed in an Article in the Apostles' Creed, surely it is not too much to ask the same liberty in a Lutheran Confession.

On such a basis we believe the Lutheran Church in America ought to be united. We believe it to be the only practicable, consistent, Christian basis, on which all evangelical Lutherans can unite. This is substantially the basis of "*the Evangelical Lutheran General Synod in North America,*" (South) Art. II, sec. 2. "We likewise hold that the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Augsburg Confession, contain the fundamental doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, and we receive and adopt them as the exponents of our faith." On this basis the General Synod has been standing for fifty years, and as now somewhat more definitely expressed in the formula, "*receiving and holding with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers the word of God, as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word.*"

On this basis may she continue to stand, the home and the hope of true, conservative Lutheranism in the nineteenth century and in this Western world! To all true Lutherans, who desire to live in unity, and to labor harmoniously, she extends a cordial welcome.

ARTICLE V.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

By Rev. J. B. Baltzly, A. M., Bucyrus, Ohio.

The discussion of this subject has engaged the best talents of the Church, from time immemorial to the present day. Almost as many views have been set forth and defended as there are treatises on the subject. Each writer seems to have reached a conclusion, according to his own theological standpoint, or religious training, or the peculiarity of his own mental structure; and, as a consequence, has presented an opinion different from the others. It may not be presumptuous in me, following the example of so many, to offer my contribution to the subject also, and should I succeed in reflecting one single ray of light upon it, I will be richly repaid for my labor in the preparation of this paper.

The wisest of men, in speaking of death, said: "Because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets: or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern; then shall the dust return to the earth as it was."

The term *dust*, here, means the body, the material constituent of man; and it is, doubtless, so denominated because of its earthly origin and its earthly end. To "*return* to the earth" signifies to die, to sink back to its primal condition, to become dust. Hence, Solomon's words may be paraphrased thus: "Then shall the *body* become *earth* as it was."

There are now, and ever have been, many curious speculations as to the final destiny of the body. There is a class of men who hold, that the body is furnished the soul for a definite *time* and *end*—as a *habitation*, and a habitation *in this life* only,—and that, having answered its sole end, it goes back

to its original state. These are of the Swedenborgian school, who, while they claim to base their doctrines upon the words of the great Teacher, practically deny Him. Their form of doctrine is nothing more nor less than a subtle phase of infidelity, one of the *wiles* of the devil, and most destructive in its results. It undermines the foundation of the Christian's dearest hope, "the redemption of his body," and its ultimate glorification in the heavenly Paradise.

Others maintain that the body, after the departure of the soul, decays and, to all human vision, is lost amid the other elements of nature around it; but that, amid all this confusion of matter, there is concealed a life-principle, which, though buried for ages, never dies, and is never lost, but which, like a grain of corn that *in dying* reproduces itself, will, at the end of the days foretold, on the morning of the resurrection, gather around itself a body like unto its original body in *form* and *elements*, freed from decrepitude, corruptibility and mortality. These hold what is usually denominated the Pauline doctrine of the resurrection.

To some, this theory may, indeed, seem fanciful, yet it is, nevertheless, a very near approximation to the true form of doctrine touching the resurrection, as it is, or at least seems to be, contained in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

But passing over other views, held in different ages, and by men of different schools, I come to the consideration of the inquiry: *What is the Intermediate State of the body? What* is it? and *where* is it, between death and the judgment?

1. At death, the body is changed into inanimate nature. The body dies, the dust returns to the earth. Death is the dissolution of the union between the soul and the body. When that union is broken up, the body ceases to live. It becomes inanimate, inactive, motionless. And this separation of the soul from the body, the Scriptures express by such terms as, "*To depart—To be absent from the body—To put off this earthly tabernacle—To be unclothed—To sleep—To rest.*"

The very moment the bodily functions cease, then the life of the body ceases. Then this tenement of clay, once warm,

active, beautiful, useful, becomes cold, inactive, deformed, useless; then this form, once so lovely, and the source of so many earthly enjoyments, becomes loathsome, and the cause of anguish and grief; then these limbs, so active now, become motionless; then these fingers, so busy now, either in deeds of benevolence, or in works of malevolence, become stiff and powerless; then these eyes, now lit up with heavenly brilliancy, and sparkling with beams of joyous life, become visionless, and obscured in utter darkness; then this brow, once illumined with shining intelligence, is mantled in the pall of death; then this voice, once as musical as an angel's, is silent as the grave; then these feet, once so swift to run in ways of virtue or of vice, are bound in the fetters of decay; then this whole physical organism becomes ghastly and repulsive to the eye—it crumbles into ruins, and "returns to the earth as it was." Earth was its origin; and earth is its end. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," is heaven's immutable law. This is the end of all that is mortal. This is the chain that holds men "all their lifetime in bondage." It is an unpleasant anticipation. Bailey's Festus speaks thus of "the fear of death:"

> "It is sad
> To see the light of beauty wane away,
> To see eyes dimming, bosoms shriveling, feet
> Losing their springs, and limbs their lily roundness;
> But sadder still to feel our heart-spring gone,
> To lose hope, care not for the coming thing,
> And feel all things go to decay with us."

2. The body is removed out of sight. However beautiful and lovely it may have been, however graceful and charming, however much the object of desire and affection, however much the source of joy and delight, as soon as death's cold fingers touch its life-springs, a desire is created in the mourners, as with the father of the faithful, to have their dead buried out of their sight. Hence the custom obtains among men, to remove, in some way, the dead from view, either by consigning them to the flames, or by embalming

them with spices, or by burying them in graves, or by lodging them in sepulchres, or by sinking them beneath the waves. But a burial under the ground is now, at least in Christian lands, the common disposition of the body. It becomes corruption, earth, and dust, and is held in death's cold chains until the resurrection.

> "The sceptered king, the burthened slave,
> The humble and the haughty, die;
> The rich, the poor, the base, the brave,
> In dust, without distinction, lie."

How this cools the blood of pride! How it checks the spirit of the haughty! How it mortifies the ungodly rich! In the lonely sepulchre, "the rich and the poor meet together!" The *grave*, the *worm*, and *dust*, three sisters of one birth, are espoused, for future wedlock, to every man, irrespective of circumstances, position, or relation in life. To a mighty conqueror, the thought, that, in the dust, he must sleep in one common bed with the poorest and meanest of earth's children, in spite of all his victories, is most humiliating; and especially, at the close of the conflict, when he returns from the field of slaughtered thousands, and enters his capital in triumph; when the trumpet bears his fame on every breeze, and the shouts of millions proclaim his victories; when the spoils of nations lie at his feet, and trains of vanquished heroes and kings bow the knee before him. Even then the sad remembrance steals into his mind, that, in the brief period of a few and evil days, he *himself* must lie down in the narrow house of clay, and become food for creeping worms, who shall exercise over *him* more absolute power, than he ever exercised over his conquered hosts! In the grave the ruler and the ruled—the conqueror and the conquered—the master and the slave—the wise and the fool—the refined and the vulgar—all must say unto corruption, "Thou art my father, and to the worm, thou art my mother and my sister."

> "The victor, who in royal chariot rode,
> The king, who robbed the poor of their abode,

The prince, who kept the world in awe,
The judge, whose dictate fixed the law,
The rich, the poor, the great, the small,
Are levelled: the grave contains them all!"

3. The body shall sleep in its resting place until the coming of Christ to judgment. It is nowhere written in the Bible, that the sleep of death will be broken prior to this period. But the hour of the resurrection is immutably set; and prophecy points to the blowing of the last trump as proclaiming that hour. For St. Panl says: "The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Jesus says: "The hour is coming"—is not *now*, but is *coming*—"in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

And Job, in looking forward, with the eye of prophetic inspiration, to the scenes and solemnities of the last great day, exclaimed in the fulness of his soul: "Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day"—not *now*, but at the *latter day*—"upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy *this body*, yet *in my flesh* shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and not for another; though my reins be consumed within me."

From these Scripture declarations, it is plain, that the body will remain in the grave until the *hour* of the resurrection; which, St. Paul says, is *at the sounding* of the archangel's

"last trump." So that the body will sleep in the earth from death until the judgment. This is the disposition of the body. In view of its mortality, and passage into the grave, the well know lines of Bryant present a forcible appeal:

> "So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan that moves
> To the pale realms of shade, where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not like the quarry-slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
> Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

From this view of the body, as resting in the earth, I pass on to consider the far more important inquiry: *What is the Intermediate State of the soul?* Where is its *abode!* and what is its *condition*, between death and the judgment? Montgomery in one brief stanza, thus presents the *intermediate state* of both soul and body:

> "Where are the dead? In heaven or hell
> Their *disembodied spirits* dwell;
> Their faded forms in bonds of clay,
> Reservod until the judgment day."

And in our most serious moments, we cry:

> "Oh, whither shall *my spirit* wing its way,
> At its departure from its house of clay?"

Where shall my soul secure a home when its eartly house shall crumble into dust? These are solemn inquiries, that concern all. There are, and ever have been, various conjectures and opinions as to the intermediate state of the soul, between death and the judgment.

Some have held that the soul, at death, becomes entirely insensible, that it sleeps sweetly in a state of total unconsciousness, from the moment of its separation from, to its reunion with, the body. They may have derived this view from

two facts: first, the Scriptures frequently speak of the dead as sleeping; and, secondly, the dying often become unconscious at the hour of their departure. But the parable of the rich man and Lazarus contains a complete refutation of this view.

Others have maintained that, at death, the spirit enters the body of another individual or animal, and may even deteriorate into the vegetable world. This idea belongs to the oldest religions of India and Egypt, and is one of the earliest forms in which the doctrine of immortality appears. It is a prominent feature in the systems of Brahminism and Buddhism, which represent the migration of the soul, after death, into the body of a higher or lower being or animal, as a reward of virtue or penalty for vice.

Others, again, have entertained the opinion, that it dwells near the tomb where its frail tenement sleeps. For this view, there is not a shadow of evidence, either from revelation or reason.

Yet others have conjectured, that it mingles with men, knows them, sees their conduct, understands their plans, and, in a measure, by divine permission, controls their thoughts, feelings and actions. And still others have held, that, the very moment the soul leaves the body, it is borne away to another sphere, or to another part of this vast universe, where it, with joy or with grief, awaits the scenes and solemnities of the last great day.

But all these are mere human conjectures, uncertain and unreliable. After all that unaided reason and imagination can do, the truth must be spoken by the mouth of Him, who "has brought life and immortality to light in the gospel." And therefore, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." And what is the "law and the testimony," bearing on the question before us? Here it is: "*And the spirit shall return to God who gave it.*"

1. The spirit after its departure from the body, returns immediately to God, to render an account of its conduct in this life.

In confirmation of this truth, I will adduce the parable of the talents. In it we are informed, that a certain man called together his servants, and entrusted to them his goods. "To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability," with the command that they should improve them. "After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them."

Now, the evident interpretation of this parable, is this: The "man traveling into a far country," denotes the Lord Jesus entering heaven from Mount Olivet. This all admit. "*His servants*" are all mankind. This is universally conceded. "*His goods*" are the gold and silver, the houses and lands, the merchandise and investments, the sheep and oxen—all material wealth, together with all knowledge, all wisdom, all talent, all influence, all circumstances, all opportunities, to *be* good, and to *do* good, to the family, to the community, to the Church and to the State. To this interpretation there is no objection.

His coming after a long time, to reckon with his servants, has a two-fold reference. The primary reference is to his coming the second time, to judge "the quick and the dead." The secondary reference is to his coming at the death of each and every member of the human family, not in person, but only in providence and dispensation, to reckon with them *in test*—not *in form—individually*, not *collectively*. And every man, who dies prior to the last great day, will have to do with Christ's coming in this secondary sense. Every man, at death, must be reckoned with *in test*. This is the only correct deduction that can be drawn from this parable. Hence, the spirit, at death, returns to God who gave it, to render up an account of its stewardship in this life. But it does not necessarily remain there always, to make the bosom of the Father its eternal home: but it returns to God to *be reckoned* with.

2. But more than this: The spirit, after its departure from the body, returns immediately to God, not only to be reckoned with, but to receive a reward corresponding precisely with its conduct in this life.

If man, in his day of probation, answer the end of his earthly existence; if he succeed in casting off the chains of lust, and obtain victory over the power of sin; if the Holy Ghost implant, in the inmost depth of his being, a divine principle of holiness; if he become a *man*, and, as such, *master* of himself; if there be a manifestation of the seeds of immortality, sown in the heart, in external leaves and blossoms and fruits of godliness; or, in sacred language, if he have improved his talents, his blessed Lord will say unto him, on the day of final reckoning, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." But if he have buried his goods in the earth—if he have neglected to become good, and to do good—if he die in his sins, Jesus will say unto him, with a countenance indicative of wrath, and a voice of commingled severity and tenderness, "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

And Jesus says, that when the righteous shall come up before the judgment bar, to hear their doom, "the Judge of all the earth," who "will do right," will say unto them, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "For I was an hungered, and thirsty, and naked and sick, and in prison, and ye ministered unto me." And to the wicked, He will say, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Thus, it is clearly evident, that the spirits of men, after their departure from their bodies, return to God, *to hear their doom*, and not all of them to remain there, for the wicked do not remain there after hearing their sentence, but are sent into a place of torment.

3. But still more; the spirit, after hearing its doom, enters at once into Sheol or Hades.

In our English Bible there are two words commonly used to denote the future home of the dead—heaven and hell. But in the Greek Testament, there are three words, viz.:

Ἅδης, οὐρανός, and *γέεννα*. The Hebrew word in the Old Testament, corresponding with Hades in the New, is שְׁאוֹל, Sheol; and these two words are used to express one and the same thing. They never mean hell or the grave; but always the place of departed spirits, without any reference to their happy or unhappy state. The Greek word *οὐρανός* always signifies heaven, the home of good and happy spirits. The Greek word *γέεννα* always and only means hell, the home of bad and unhappy spirits. *Ἅδης*, signifying merely a place of departed spirits, irrespective of character and state, includes, in its borders, both heaven and hell—heaven and hell are but two apartments of Hades. In this position, the Scriptures will sustain me. Jesus says, that when "the rich man died, he lifted up his eyes *ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ*, in Hades, being in torment;" and when "Lazarus died, he was carried by angels *εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἀβραάμ*, into Abraham's bosom." In another place, the apartment in which Lazarus was, is called *παράδεισος*, Paradise. So that Abraham's bosom and Paradise are one and the same place. Now, if it can be proved from Scripture, that Paradise is in Hades, then it will be manifest that both the rich man and Lazarus went to Hades. This can be done. Jesus, when he gave up the ghost, went, not to *γέεννα*, hell, but to Hades, the place of departed spirits. This is evident from his own declaration. Of himself Jesus says, in the sixteenth Psalm: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." Now the Hebrew word, here translated hell, is Sheol. But the universally received Greek translation of Sheol, is Hades. Since Hades never means hell, but only a place of departed spirits, as a consequence, the correct translation of the above quotation of the sixteenth Psalm is, "Thou wilt not leave my soul *ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ*," in the place of departed spirits. So that Jesus, when he expired, went from the cross to Hades. Nothing can be clearer than this. But Jesus said to the dying thief, at his side, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Here it is declared, that Jesus and the dying malefactor went together to one and the same

place—went to *Paradise.* But, according to the sixteenth Psalm, Jesus went to Hades. It is manifest, from these combined declarations of the word of God, that Jesus and the dying thief went from the cross to Paradise in Hades. Hence Paradise must be in Hades, and, without controversy, the rich man and Lazarus went to Hades at their death. But while they are both in Hades, they are not necessarily in the same state, nor yet in the same place or apartment in Hades. For we are told, that the rich man is in a state of *torment*, while Lazarus is in a state of *comfort.* Beside, the divine narrative informs us, that there is an impassable gulf, dividing Hades into two apartments. And so great is this chasm as to render it impossible to pass from one apartment to the other. And, therefore, as the rich man and Lazarus are not on the same side of the gulf, they are not in the same place. They are both in Hades, but not the same apartment of it. The apartment to which the rich man went, the Scriptures call *γέεννα.* hell; and that to which Lazarus went, they call *ὀυρανός,* Abraham's bosom, Paradise, heaven. And, therefore, inasmuch as all spirits, upon hearing their sentence, must pass away into one of these apartment, it is conclusive, that the good will go where Lazarus and the dying thief are, with Jesus in *ὀυρανός*, heaven, which is in Hades; and the bad will go where the rich man is, in *γέεννα,* hell, also in Hades. So that the spirit, after its departure from the body, after hearing its doom, and upon the execution of its sentence, enters immediately into Hades, either to a state and place of *suffering* or of *enjoyment.* And here, in Hades, the righteous enjoy bliss, such as 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived.' But the wicked experience miseries such as are represented by the gnawings of "the worm that never dies," and burnings of "the fire that is never quenched."

4. But once more: the state of spirits in Hades, between death and the judgment, is not one of probation, nor yet of purgation.

There are not a few men, who are vain and foolish enough

to believe, that hell is not the endless home of the finally impenitent; and who even cherish a hope of deliverance from it, should they fail, in this life, to secure the great reward of future happiness. But this is a vain delusion—a groundless presumption—an unwarrantable perversion of the word of God. The Scriptures nowhere represent Hades as a state of *probation*, nor yet as a state of *purgation*, but only as a state of endless *rewards*. To this they conduct us; and here they leave us. But, with great explicitness, they teach, that if once "the wicked are driven away in their wickedness;" if once they enter Hades, then their doom is fixed forever; then their reward, though not complete, in degree, is unchangeable as to its character; and because of this, they anticipate no change for the better, as to the nature of their condition, but only an increase of their present misery—a fuller realization of the same woe after the reunion of soul and body at the final judgment. The apprehension of *increased* punishment, of the same kind, constrained the devils to ask Jesus, on a certain occasion, "Art thou come to torment us *before* the time?" before the judgment of the last great day? The same fearful apprehension continually alarms the impenitent in Hades, prior to the final reckoning. Besides, the Scriptures declare, concerning the permanency of the doom of the wicked hereafter, "Let him that is unjust, be unjust still; and let him that is filthy, be filthy still;" and this little word *still*, in this connection, means always, forever. Again they declare, "As the tree falleth, so it lieth." As illustrative of this truth, take the case of the rich man. When he appealed to Abraham for relief, no word of comfort or hope fell on his anxious ears. But the response was, "Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented. And as excluding hope, he added, "Besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they that would pass hence to you, cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence!" This excludes all idea of probation, or purgation, effected by suffering, and

ending in deliverance from this place of punishment. And thus, while the intermediate state of the righteous is one of blessedness with Christ in heaven, that of the wicked is one of wretchedness, in banishment from His presence and the glory of His power.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ASSURANCE OF FAITH.

Translated from Chemnitz' Examen, by Rev. H. E. Jacobs, M. A., Professor in Pennsylvania College.

The eminent Scotch Theologian, Dr. Buchanan, in his Cunningham Lectures on Justification by Faith, (p. 111), declares the controversy on Justification at the era of the Reformation of "such value, in a theological point of view, that, even at the present day, a thorough course of reading on the discussions which then took place between the respective advocates of Romish error and Protestant truth, may justly be said to be the best method of studying the whole doctrine of Justification." From the chapter of Chemnitz' *Examen* on Justification, we present the following translation, somewhat condensed, of a most valuable extract, which sets forth with marked distinctness that only answer to the anxious questions of the heart, which can give the conscience peace.

Our opponents profess to ascribe reconciliation and remission of sins, to divine mercy shown us for Christ's sake. Yet they add that this forgiveness is imputed or applied to no one, exept those, who, by works of repentance and love, have so disposed themselves, as to be no longer unworthy. But as conscience always doubts whether a sufficiency of such works be afforded, a necessary result of this doctrine is, that anxious minds, in prayer, in trial, in strife with the wrath of God, on account of sins, and finally in agony of death, never can find sure and firm consolation, by which, under the pres-

sure of despair, to prevent themselves from rushing to everlasting ruin; for the more they thus endeavor to dispose and prepare themselves, so much the more deeply do they sink into doubt.

If, on the other hand, they presume concerning the sufficiency and worth of their preparations, they fall into the condemnation of the Pharisee, Luke 18, viz.: that Israel by going about to establish their own righteousness, did not come to the law of righteousness, because it was not of faith, but, as it were, of works. Thus, on both sides, they close the way to justification. We can, therefore, understand the intention of the doctrine of Trent, which prescribes these preparations for justification. It was to render all faith of the remission of sins, doubtful and uncertain, *i. e.* nothing. For thus Paul declares, Rom. 4 : 14: "For if they which are of the law, be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect."

Another statement from the decree of the Council of Trent, is: "Even though any one be truly justified, yet he ought not, without any doubt, to be confident that he has been justified." The Papist doctrine, therefore, contains nothing but doubt, whether we regard the preparation for justification, or its principal cause. Let the reader consider the reason given by Andradius, on account of which every one should doubt whether he be truly justified. "Some sins," says he, "are so hidden, that it is not easy to discover them. The recesses of the human heart are inscrutable. No one, therefore, who is ignorant of the manner, in which he may have committed a crime, can acknowledge that he is guilty of it; and, hence, must remain forever in doubt, whether he be truly justified."

The Papists do well in writing, upon their theology, the inscription that it is a doctrine of doubt, which cannot give the conscience sure and steadfast consolation, as a support in trouble. On the contrary, leaving it in the saddest uncertainty, this doctrine only sinks it the more deeply into despair. If they declare anything else, concerning their teaching, their very statement, as well as experience itself, would convict them of falsehood. If we alone were to say that the

entire Romish Church, is nothing but a manufactory of doubt, we would not readily be believed. Therefore, we give this testimony of their own adherents, and add to it our approval, viz., that the doctrine of the Council of Trent, concerning Justification, cannot afford the consciences of true believers, sure and firm comfort, to which in trial they may betake themselves with unwavering confidence; but that it casts them into doubt, and leaves them there forever. Let him, therefore, who delights in such consolation, as affords only doubt and despair, enjoy it. No one can pretend that he has been deceived. The Papists themselves proclaim that their doctrine does not afford consciences peace, in which to rest with security and certainty. He, therefore, who wishes to be in doubt concerning his salvation, should embrace the doctrine of the Papists; for it is this which they promise as the sum and end of their teaching.

Yet the Tridentine fathers do not rest even here; but proceed still farther, and declare: "Even though with true faith, any one believe that, by divine mercy, on account of Christ, his sins are forgiven him, he ought not to consider it a certainty that he has been released from his sins." Yea they add: "If any one who believes that his sins are forgiven, only freely by divine mercy, for Christ's sake, rests in this confidence, then, and for this very reason, his sins are not forgiven him." For the glory of God, and the comfort of consciences, we must contend against such blasphemy. It is an insult to the heavenly doctrine to defame it as a doctrine of doubt, in the article concering the forgiveness of sins. For the heavenly doctrine has been revealed to the human race, and offered in the Chnrch, in order thar true believers may have firm and sure comfort, in resting securely against all trials, in the promise of the gospel, concerning their reconciliation with God, and their adoption and reception into everlasting life. We will not discuss this at length, but only note the chief points with as great brevity as possible. In order that this may be done with the greater advantage, we will first separate from it those subjects, by confusing it with which, the Papists adroitly seek to change the discussion.

Our argument is not concerning the faith of heretics, who embrace and cherish false and blasphemous opinions, overturning the true foundation. Nor is it a question concerning Epicurean assurance, which promises for itself impunity in its perseverance in sin. Even in reference to its adherents, we have no doubt to offer, but, unless they be converted, the sure threatening of divine wrath: "They which do such things, have neither lot nor part in the kingdom of God, and of Christ." Acts 8 : 21 ; Gal. 5 : 21.

We confess, also, that in the present weakness of the flesh, true faith is not perfect, but is often tried by many doubts; hence, the frequent feebleness of the trust which is exercised in trial, in the midst of much fear. Yet we teach, that we dare not indulge in doubt, but must constantly strive against it, with the prayer: "Lord I believe; help thou mine unbelief." "Lord, increase our faith." We also warn the justified not to abuse their confidence in the mercy of God, by nourishing and strengthening security and wantonness of the flesh, which must always be curbed and repressed by the rein of the fear of the Lord. Nor is it when we consider our infirmity, or our new qualities or virtues, that we obtain from them the confidence that we are, without doubt, accepted by God to everlasting life; for we distinctly confess with Paul: "In this am I not justified."

The true state of the controversy, therefore, between us and the Papists, is this: They teach that when the sinner, in sincere repentance, with true faith, conceived of the word of God, by the Holy Ghost, apprehends the promise of gratuitous mercy, and at the same time with it, apprehends the Son of God himself as Mediator, who is our righteousness, he cannot determine, with sure confidence, that his sins are forgiven. He indeed can hope, and promise for himself the best things from God's mercy, yet these must be left, without sure confidence, suspended in the midst of wavering doubt; because we can believe that which is false, and hope can deceive. This doubt they number not among the infirmities and defects of the flesh, but among the virtues of faith, so that unless doubt be present to adorn and commend faith, it

is the empty trust of heretics, and not justifying faith. Yet, inasmuch as they see a conflict between faith and doubt, they feign that faith in general determines that the divine promises concerning the mercy of God, the merit of Christ, and the efficacy of the sacraments, are true and certain; but in reference to their application to believers, faith ought to remain suspended in constant doubt, viz., as to whether my faith which relies upon the promise of God, ought certainly to determine, according to the passages from the gospel: "Son, be of good cheer: thy sins be forgiven thee." "Thy faith hath made thee whole."

The following are the chief foundations of the doctrine peculiar to the gospel:

1. A sure and clear argument is derived from the nature and characteristic of a gratuitous promise; for confidence of our salvation does not depend upon the penetration of natural gifts, by which I may be able to pierce through the heaven of heavens, and scrutinize what has been decreed concerning me in the secret counsel of the Trinity; but it is built upon this foundation, that God coming forth from his hidden glory, has revealed to us his will in the word, as Paul does not hesitate to affirm, 2 Cor. 2, that we have the mind of Christ. In the law, indeed, the will of God is thus revealed: "He who does these things, shall live by them." But, if by means of doubt, eternal life can be apprehendred, there is no promise more suitable than that of the law; for, on account of the condition of perfect fulfilment annexed to it, it leaves consciences in constant doubt. But inasmuch as it is not doubt, but faith, which justifies, and it is not he who doubts, but he who believes, that has everlasting life; God offers the free promise of the gospel, which depends not on our works, but on the mercy of God, on account of the obedience of his Son, our Mediator. The reason why this promise was offered, Paul shows in Rom. 4: "It is of faith, that it might be of grace, to the end that the promise might remain sure." But was it only that the promise might be sure in general and by itself? Yea, Paul says; that it might remain sure to all the seed." But how? "It is written," says he, "also for us who

believe." For, in general, and considered by itself, even the promise of the law is sure. But it is of grace, and by faith, that this promise is sure to us. Hence we have that beautiful passage in Heb. 6, declaring that God, in delivering his promise, "confirmed it by an oath, that, by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope set before us." You hear, therefore, that the promise is sure, not only in general, and considered by itself, but that we, who have fled for refuge, might have a strong consolation for laying hold upon the hope set before us. From this basis, John derives an argument in his first epistle, c. 5: "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar." But John speaks not merely of general assent. For he adds: "These things have I written unto you, who believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." For if I believe in the Son of God, and yet doubt whether I have everlasting life, I do not believe the promise: "He that believeth in the Son, hath everlasting life;" and, therefore, according to John, I make God a liar.

2. From the character of justifying faith. For there is ascribed to faith *πληροφορία, ὑπόστασις, ἔλεγχος, παῤῥησία, πεποίθησις;* which certainly do not mean doubt, but sure and firm trust; as I could prove by examples, if I did not fear prolixity. John thus speaks, with a special design, concerning faith, 1 Ep. 3 : 14: "We *know* that we have passed from death unto life;" 5 : 13, "That ye *may know* that ye have everlasting life." 1 Pet. 1 : 13: "Hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you." Heb. 3 : 6: "If we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. 10 : 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, v. 23, "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith, without wavering." In Heb. 6, the most appropriate metaphor of an anchor, is used. For when an anchor falls upon that which has only the appearance of ground, it cannot hold the ship securely; but when it is cast upon that which is fixed and unyielding, it steadfastly holds

the ship, against all the waves. Thus, says he, the anchor of our hope, is cast into heaven, where Christ our High Priest is, who apprehends, fastens and holds that anchor, as he says, John 10 : 28 : "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hands;" or, as Paul says: "I apprehend, yea rather am apprehended of him." So, also, Rom. 5 : 1 : "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God." "We stand in the grace of God, and glory in hope of the glory of God." Rom. 4 : 16: "It is of faith, that it might be by grace." These most precious consolations, the Papists endeavor to tear from us, by means of doubt. But if doubt were a virtue, we would not be commanded to strive against doubt; nor would we be commanded to pray: "Increase our faith;" "Help mine unbelief." There is also a strong argument against the doubt of the Papists in 2 Cor. 13 : 5, in which Paul says: "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." Hear you this then, that every one should examine himself whether he have faith, and if he know not that he is in Christ, he is a reprobate!

By various artifices, the Papists endeavor to elude Rom. 8 : 38, 39. Pighius, quoting from Thomas Aquinas, says that Paul speaks here concerning the certainty of his own salvation, which he derived from a special revelation; and that he does not affirm that every believer in Christ has a certainty of the same kind. But this is manifestly false; for in this entire passage, Paul speaks in the plural, and lays as the foundation of this certainty: "Christ died, yea rather is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

Andradius, seeing that these errors cannot stand, says that the verb πέπεισμαι signifies not certain trust, but a persuasion of probability; and that its use in many passages of Scripture, shows that even this can be deceived. But it is also used for certain, sure and undoubted persuasion, as is shown by 2 Tim. 1 : 12: "I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him." The question,

however, is in reference to the meaning of the word in Rom. 8. The entire context declares: "If God be for us, who can be against us." "How shall he not with him also freely give us all things." "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" "Who is he that condemneth?" "It is God who justifieth:" "it is Christ who died." "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution," etc. "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us." Then follows the word πέπεισμαι. It is clear, that no sane man would explain this whole discussion, as having reference to doubt.

3. The doctrine in reference to the true use of the sacraments, contrary to the doubt of the Papists, affords the most comforting arguments, concerning the certainty of the salvation of believers. For it is sure that the Son of God, by his own institution, added to the promise of grace the seals, which are called sacraments; in order that the promise of the gospel might be offered not only in general, but also that in the administration of the sacraments, this general promise might be offered, applied and sealed personally to each believer, who uses it in faith; and that our weak faith, which in a general promise, can hardly sustain itself in hope against hope, might be aided and strengthened by the efficacy of the sacraments. Thus, in Rom. 4, circumcision is called a seal of the righteousness of faith. Gal. 3 : 27: "As many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." 1 Pet. 3 : 21: "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God." In the use of the Holy Supper, the Son of God applies, to each one coming to it worthily, this assurance: "Take, eat,; this is my body which was given for you," "This cup is the New Testament," etc. Thus the prayer of Damascenus: "Make me worthy to receive it, as a seal of the coming life and kingdom." How sweet, too, is the promise concerning absolution: "Whosoever's sins ye remit, they are remitted to them." "Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Hence Gerson is right in contending that absolution should be pronounced, not in the optative, but on account of the certainty of that which is

promised, in the indicative mode, as Nathan uses this form of absolution: "The Lord *hath* put away thy sins;" and Christ, "Thy faith *hath* saved thee; go, in peace."

4. Very decided arguments against the doubt of the Papists, are derived from those passages of Scripture, which testify to the sealing of believers by the Holy Ghost. Eph. 1 : 13 : "After that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance." 2 Cor. 1 : 22, "Who also hath sealed us, and given us the earnest of the spirit, in our hearts." Eph. 4 : 30 : "The Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." For a seal is attached only to such objects as we wish to be most undoubted and certain, in order thereby to remove all possible doubt and uncertainty. Nor does the sealing of the Holy Ghost in all believers, refer to a mere general persuasion; but of such a nature that each one may affirm for himself, that the promise is firm and sure for him, and contrary to that doubt, which naturally inheres in the mind.

Another word is token or pledge (*arrhabo*), meaning a guarantee, or security, or sign, by which the giving of faith is ratified and confirmed, so that it be not doubted, but certain faith may adhere to it. This word affords us a most precious consolation. For inasmuch as we are saved, but by hope, Rom. 8, and in the meantime faith is shaken by various temptations, in order that, on this account, we may not doubt concerning the good will of God, the forgiveness of sins, adoption, salvation, and eternal life, God has given to us as a guarantee, pledge and token, not an angel, or any other creature, but the Holy Ghost himself, who is of the same nature with the Father and the Son, in order that we may rest, contrary to all doubt, in confidence of that salvation, which will be revealed in us. These metaphors are elsewhere explained in clear passages, 1 John 5 : 10; Rom. 8 : 16; Gal. 4 : 6; 1 Cor. 2 : 12; Eph. 1 : 18. But in reference to these most precious passages, Andradius says that believers are rendered certain concerning reconciliation, by the witness of the Holy Ghost within the soul. Because, says he, without a special revelation, it cannot be certain to any one that that witness

of mind, which many feel, is a voice of the Holy Ghost. It is indeed certain, that not all the thoughts of the human mind, are movements of the Holy Ghost; but inasmuch as the word of the gospel is the ministry of the Spirit, 2 Cor. 3, John 6, and from the hearing of faith, the Spirit is received, Gal. 3, therefore, it is certain that the testimony in the minds of believers, conceived of faith according to the promise of the gospel, is the sealing of the Holy Ghost, as Paul says, "After that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

Andradius, on the contrary, wishes that these matters be judged not according to the word of promise, but that other special revelations are to be expected, without which it is doubtful and uncertain, whether the trust of believers, and even the sealing of the Holy Ghost, described by Paul, be true.

5. The same is proved by the examples of the saints, as of Abraham, Rom. 4 : 18, *sq.*, Paul says: "Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations. And being not weak in faith, he staggered not at the promise of God, through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God, being fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was able to perform; and, therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness." These are not words, but thunderbolts against the decree of Trent, which teaches that "Sins are forgiven no one who rests in trust of the forgiveness of sins, according to the promise." Paul, on the contrary, says, "Therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness." Neither does Paul speak of a general assent but of its application individually, viz., to Abraham.

So, also, David, Ps. 23 : 4: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." Ps. 27 : 1: "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" Ps. 125 : 1: "They that trust in the Lord, shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever."

And Paul, Rom. 8 : 35—39.

Luke 7 : 50: "Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." Matt. 9 : 2: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."

6. Doubt conflicting with trust, is distinctly rebuked in Scripture. Matt. 6 : 30: "O ye of little faith;" 14 : 31, "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" The word διστάζειν is here used, which signifies when the mind is impelled by its feelings, now hither and now thither, so that it does not remain in one opinion. This is the same as the Papists say that hope, on account of probable reasons, assents to the one side, but yet with fear of the other side. In Rom. 4, James 1, Mark 1, the verb διακρίνεσθαι is opposed to faith, as Budaeus thinks, because those who hesitate, on account of their varying opinions, quarrel and dispute, as it were, with themselves. It is manifest that the faith which the Papists fashion, is of this nature.

Luke 12 : 28, instead of ὀλιγοπιστίας, uses μετεωρίζεσθαι, which signifies a mind in suspense between double and anxious doubts; just as objects suspended aloft, with very little force, are moved hither and thither. Thus Thucydides: All Greece μετέωρος ἦν. The Greek translators of Psalms 41, 92, 87, use this word in reference to the stronger waves of the sea. This antithesis James explains, c. 1 : 6, 7: "Let him ask in faith, nothing wavering; for he that wavereth, is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of God." But James speaks not simply concerning unbelief, but uses the word διακρίνεσθαι, of which we have just spoken. Therefore, it simply condemns the Tridentine doubt. Let the reader observe, also, that the decree of Trent makes hesitancy a virtue of faith. But Paul in Rom. 4, ascribes this to unbelief. In Rom. 14, these two forms of expression, are synonymous, viz., Whatsoever is not of faith, and whatsoever is done with a conscience which doubts. The same chapter affirms not only that doubt, by itself, is a vice, but also that it so contaminates other works, as likewise to make of them sin.

7. It is of advantage to consider the source of the doctrine

which commands those truly believing, to doubt concerning the forgiveness of their sins. For, according to Matthew 9, the Scribes do not doubt, concerning the general promise of the forgiveness of sins, but they accuse Christ of blasphemy, because he taught that he so certainly promised and bestowed the forgiveness of sins upon believers, as to bid the paralytic to be of good cheer. So, too, when Christ, Luke 7 : 42, absolved a woman, "Thy sins are forgiven," "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace," the Pharisees murmured that this was blasphemy.

The Novatians also did not altogether deny the forgiveness of sins, to those who were converted after a fall, but whilst bidding them hope, warned them not to consider it certain, that their sins either could or would be forgiven. Thus their error is described (Tripart. B. 9): "That the fallen should be invited to repentance, but that the forgiveness of their sins, should be left to the power of God." Thus Ambrose also declares: "The Novatians say that they reserve the power of forgiving sins, for God alone. But Christ commanded his disciples to loose sins." Again he says: "The Novatians, in order to establish their doubt concerning the forgiveness of sins, bring forward Acts 8 : 22, "Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." There, they said, Peter certainly did not say that sins are to be forgiven the penitent. To this Ambrose replies, that Peter thus spoke because Simon Magus did not truly believe, but meditated deceit. Let the reader observe, therefore, that, in this controversy, the Novatians did not contend simply that God was willing to forgive sins to no one who repented after a fall, but the question in dispute, according to Ambrose, was, whether a minister of the Church, to whom the power of forgiving sins had been granted, could certainly affirm, to those who repented, that their sins were forgiven, or whether he should state this only in a doubtful way.

With this narration of the Novatian controversy, let the doctrine of the Papists concerning doubt be compared.

8. Lastly, we have excellent passages from the old writers,

showing the spuriousness of the dogma of the Papists, in reference to doubt. We will only present those, in which it is clearly seen that the same objections were made against assurance of faith, as are now presented by the Papists.

Of the objection of arrogance, or spiritual pride, Augustine says, concerning the words of the Lord, Thy sins are forgiven thee: "Therefore, presume not concerning the performance of work by thee, but concerning the grace of Christ. For by grace are ye saved, says the apostle. Therefore it is not arrogance, but faith, it is not pride, but devotion, to proclaim what you have received." In his exposition of Ps. 88, he thus answers the objection of unworthiness and unfitness: "This God has said, this He has promised, this He has sworn. Inasmuch, therefore, as the promise is sure, not according to our merits, but His mercy, no one ought to proclaim with trembling that of which he dare not doubt."

Bernard in his third sermon, in reference to the seven fragments, says: "I consider that there are things, in which all my hope is placed; the love of adoption, the truth of the promise, and the power of fulfilling it, although my foolish thought murmurs, saying: "Who art thou, or how great is that glory, or by what merits do you hope to obtain this?" To this I confidently reply: "I know whom I have believed, and am sure, because in his exceeding love, he has adopted me, his promise is true, and he is able to perform it. This is the threefold cord, which cannot be torn, and which, having been let down from our fatherland into this prison, I earnestly pray we may be able to hold, until he aid us, draw us, and bring us up to the sight of the glory of the great God." The same writer most beautifully replies to a passage from Solomon, often quoted by the opponents of this doctrine: "Who can be saved?" say the disciples. With men this is impossible, but not with God. Then why do we, who are already sure of its possibility, dispute concerning God's will? "Who knows whether he is worthy of love or hatred?" "Who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Here it is clearly necessary that faith come to our aid? Here truth must assist us, in order that what is hidden concerning us in the heart of the

Father, may be revealed to us by his Spirit, which, bearing witness, persuades our spirits that we are children of God; but he persuades by calling, and justifying freely through faith."

To the objection of presumption, Augustine replies in his exposition of John, "We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and do you dare to promise yourself that you will not come into judgment. God forbid, you say, that I should promise myself this: but I believe Him who promises; He shall not come into condemnation. Therefore, I do not come into condemnation, not because of my presumption, but of His promise."

Cyprian in his sermon on Mortality, says: "What room is there here for anxiety and solicitude? In the midst of these things, who can be trembling and sad, unless he who is without faith and hope? For the fear of death, belongs to him who is unwilling to depart to Christ; and he is unwilling to depart to Christ, who does not believe that he is about to reign with Christ? For it is written, The just live by faith. If you are just, and live by faith, if you truly believe in God, why do you not embrace the assurance that you will be with Christ, and that you are secure in his promise?" Again: "God promises to thee at thy departure from this world, immortality; and do you doubt and waver? This is not to have known God at all; this is to offend Christ, the Lord of believers, with the sin of unbelief; this is for one established in the Church, not to have faith, within the household of faith." "If we believe in Christ, let us have faith in his words and promises."

These arguments are so sure and clear, that it is wonderful to find men, and even those boasting of the name of Church, who dare to state the contrary, and by threatening with anathemas, to tear away from consciences true, firm and sure comfort, so as to force men again to former torments.

The objections which they urge against this, are: 1. That heretics who defend false and blasphemous opinions, and even Epicureans, in the midst of their crimes, without repentance,

can imagine such a persuasion of certainty for themselves. A reply to this is easy. For we treat neither of false or dead, but of true faith, and in reference to those who truly believe.

2. They oppose to assurance, a consideration of our own weakness and unworthiness. They specially enlarge upon the fact, as to how pleasing to God is the virtue of true humility, acknowledging and confessing its own unworthiness. I reply: Our faith both has, and ought to have added to it, true humility, which seriously considers, acknowledges, and confesses our own unworthiness, so that it does not dare, in God's judgment, to present personal worth, as a ground of justification; but earnestly believes, and confesses from the heart, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight, shall no man living be justified." But this humility does not make faith doubtful and wavering, inasmuch as it does not detain conscience in the law, in order to present individual merit to the judgment of God, but it impels and urges the conscience to seek another promise, in which freely, on account of the Son as Mediator, the Father grants reconciliation, so that, inasmuch as in his own worth, man cannot find that, upon which he can safely stand in God's judgment, he apprehends a Mediator, in whose wounds salvation is firm and secure, to those who truly believe.

3. Contrary to assurance of salvation, they oppose the doctrine of predestination or election, and in order to do this with some apparent reason, say that a rash presumption concerning the secret mystery of predestination, is to be avoided. It is very true, that we also earnestly teach that the secret counsel of God, is not to be searched into, in order that we may determine, whether we are of the number of the elect; for this would precipitate us into many errors, and at last into despair itself. For we must judge concerning election, not from the thoughts of reason, or doubtful speculations, as to what has been decreed in the secret counsel of God, in reference to either the salvation or condemnation of each one, but from the word of God, in which God has revealed to us his will; yet not from the law, which declares concerning our works, merits, and worth, but from the gospel. The gos-

pel, too, speaks concerning election, not as the poets narrate of the tablets of the Fates, that some were written for life, and others for death; from which nothing could be clearly evident to us, as to whether we were in the number of those to be saved, or of those to be condemned. But the doctrine of predestinatien presents the decrees which God made, and afterwards revealed in his word, with the reasons and manner of salvation or condemnation, that there is: 1. A decree concerning the redemption of the human family, by the obedience and passion of Christ as Mediator. 2. A decree concerning those, both Jews and Gentiles, who by the ministry of the word, are to be called to a participation in the merits of Christ for salvation. 3. A decree of God that, by his Holy Spirit, he wishes, through the hearing of the word, to work in the hearts of men, in order that they may repent and believe the gospel. 4. A decree of God, that he wishes to justify and save those, who, when they perceive their sins, and the wrath of God, flee by faith to the throne of grace, and embrace Christ as the Mediator offered in the promise of the gospel; but also that it is his will to condemn those who reject the word, and despise and do not embrace the promise.

This is the sum of the doctrine concerning predestination, as revealed in the word, which does not teach that true believers ought to doubt, whether they are in the number of the elect, but as Paul, in Rom. 8, has declared in the climax: "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified." Therefore, they whom God has called and justified, ought to consider it certain that they have been elected. If the reader examine the passages of Scripture concerning election, he will clearly see that the doctrine of predestination has been revealed in Scripture, not that it might render the salvation of believers doubtful and uncertain, but that it might be a ground of certainty. Eph. 1 : 4: "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world." 2 Tim. 2 : 19: "The foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are his." John 10 : 27, 28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and

they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." Rom. 8: "Who will condemn, who will separate God's elect?" Rom. 11 : 29: "The gifts and callings of God, are without repentance-" 2 Tim. 1 : 7: "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." "For he hath called us with an holy calling, according to his own purpose."

I have not undertaken to explain the entire doctrine of predestination; but have wished only to show, that the election of God, as revealed in God's word, does not undermine, but confirms and establishes the certainty of salvation, and the assurance of believers. For the twelfth chapter of the Council of Trent, states what is false, when it says that from the word of God, we cannot know whom God has chosen, except a special revelation, in addition to the word, be given. Nor is it true, that no true believer, without a special revelation, can determine, from the word of God, that he is in the number of the elect. For these statements conflict with Scripture, as we have shown.

4. They oppose to this doctrine, also their opinion concerning perseverance. Although believers may be very certain of present grace, yet no one is certain, whether he will persevere to the end; and, inasmuch as only those are saved who thus persevere to the end, there cannot, therefore, be any certain trust concerning the salvation of believers. I reply: Both Scripture and experience teach that many do not persevere, but fall from grace. Yet this happens, not because God is unwilling to preserve, to the end, those believers whom he has once received into grace, but because many, by security, mistrust and works of the flesh, offend the Holy Ghost, and cast off faith. Therefore, men are not to be taught, that they may conduct themselves in whatever way they please, without being able to fall from the grace of God. For it is written, Heb. 3 : 14: "If we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." But they are to be admonished, by the Spirit, to mortify the deeds of the flesh, by faith firmly to cleave to Christ, to be united to him more and more, through the use of the Word and sacraments, to seek from

God the gift of perseverance, and to strive, lest by the wantonness of the flesh, they do lose the gift of perseverance.

In this way, they ought not to doubt concerning perseverance, but to determine according to the promise, Phil. 1 : 6: "He which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." We are called to eternal fellowship with Christ; not that he may afterwards cast off, those whom he has united to himself; but, as he says, "They shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." 1 Cor. 1 : 8: "Who shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." As David says: "I shall never be put to confusion;" and John: "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life;" and: "We *know* that when he shall appear, we shall be like him." Rom. 8 : 38: "I am persuaded that neither things present, nor things to come, shall separate us from the love of Christ;" 2 Tim. 4 : 8: "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." Rom. 5 : 2: "We rejoice in hope of the glory of God." These passages clearly show that the hope of believers, is not suspended between heaven and earth, in uncertain doubt.

5. They cite such passages as the following: 1 Cor. 10 : 12: "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." Phil. 2 : 12: "Work out your own salvation, with fear and trembling." Rom. 11 : 20: "Be not high-minded, but fear." 1 Pet. 1 : 17: "Pass the time of your sojourning in fear." Ps. 28 : 14: "Happy is the man that feareth always." There is a general reply to these passages. For they warn us, not to fall, by a persuasion of certainty concerning our salvation, into carnal security, by which faith is extinguished; not to indulge in wicked affections, for thus faith is cast off; and admonish us that, unless we remain in the goodness of God, we will fall. For faith does not remain in those who, without repentance, indulge their wicked desires. These passages, therefore, do not treat of any doubt connected with faith. They are only exhortations warning us not by security to

extinguish, or by works of the flesh, to cast off, that faith which has the certainty of salvation; but to exercise it constantly in striving against the flesh. Such passages reveal to believers their weakness, not to cast faith into doubt, but in order that they may not become presumptuous, by confiding vainly in their own gifts; that they may depend entirely upon the Lord, and the more firmly and lovingly, may cling to the mercy which has been promised for Christ's sake.

6. Andradius uses also this argument against assurance. Paul says: "I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified." Therefore Paul was not sure of his justification. I reply: Paul not only doubts whether he is justified before God, by his renewal of works, but distinctly adds what is more: "In this am I not justified." He assigns the reason that, although his conscience did not condemn him, and before men he was blameless, yet that, in the judgment of God, this righteousness could not stand. Therefore, in the obedience and merit of Christ, he seeks another righteousness which he could present to the judgment and wrath of God, so as to be reconciled, adopted, and accepted to everlasting life. Concerning this justification, he does not speak doubtfully, but, Rom. 5 : 1: "Being justified by faith, we have peace." "We have access to the grace, wherein we stand, and rejoice." Rom. 8: "Who is he that condemneth? It is God that justifieth."

These foundations are manifest, firm and immovable. But as it has been objected that many have abused this doctrine to their security, the correct reply is, that the truth of the doctrine is not to be changed, because of its abuse; but the commandment of Paul, concerning dividing aright the word, is to be observed. For, to the impenitent, these consolations are not offered; but only threats, Eph. 5, Col. 3, 1 Cor. 6. "Those who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." But to those, who in fear, flee, by faith, to the throne of grace, we offer not doubt, but firm and sure comfort, from the promise of the gospel. Yet, as in believers themselves, there is still flesh and spirit, an old and a new man, they are always to be reminded not to abuse the promise of the gospel,

in order to establish security and wantonness of the flesh. Those who thus abuse this doctrine, should consider what is written in 2 Pet. 3 : 16: "They wrest the Scriptures, unto their own destruction."

Lastly, we add, that it must be remembered, that we do not here speak of an ideal certainty of faith, which, in this weakness of the flesh, is tried by no doubt, which feels no trembling; as if weak and feeble faith, which does not feel perfect assurance and absolute certainty, were to be regarded as not true faith. For we have above shown, that faith, even though it be weak, if it only embrace a true object, is true. But you ask: Why, therefore, do you teach this doctrine concerning the certainty of faith, in the infirmity of this life? I reply:

I. In order that we may know, that whatever doubt we feel, does not belong to faith, but to such opinions as these: "In my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing." "To me, willing to do good, evil is present." Believers, therefore, do not present these doubts to God, as though they were virtues; but they acknowledge, that faith, in so far as it is a work of virtue in us, is imperfect, and they seek to have this defilement which faith acquires from the flesh, covered and forgiven. Yet, on account of the object, which, in this weakness, faith apprehends, they have sure and firm consolation.

II. In order that we may not indulge in doubts, but strive against weakness of faith; that we may always aim at certainty, and not suffer our confidence to be destroyed, but seek that it be strengthened, and increased. For this purpose, in the exercise of faith, God has offered the remedies of the Word and sacraments and prayer. Yea, the Spirit also aids our infirmities, in order that faith may strive, that the smoking flax may not be quenched, and that, although thus weak, faith may still have that sure consolation of which Paul speaks: "Not that I have apprehended; but rather that I am apprehended of Him."

ARTICLE VII.

THE PASTOR OF THE FUTURE.

By Rev. C. A. Stork, M. A., Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Dwight quotes with approval, in his body of Divinity, the remark of a brother minister, which will serve as a text for this short discussion: "It was a memorable observation of a late venerable minister, a man distinguished for wisdom and excellence, and of more than sixty years standing in the sacred office, that, among all the ministers, at whose dismission he had been present, and who were dismissed for some fault in themselves, neither heresy, nor immorality, had occasioned the dismission of more than one out of twenty; while imprudence had been the cause of this calamity to the remaining nineteen." To put it into plain English, nineteen out of twenty ministers that fail, do so for lack of common sense. This fact is full of suggestion to our Educational Committee and Examining Boards; but we propose to use it for another purpose. This hint is about as near as the learned Doctor ever comes to the discussion of that part of the ministerial office which might properly be called, for want of a better name, administrative.

There are many good things said in the five chapters which are devoted to the minister and his duty in Dr. Dwight's great work. Who are ministers, what they should preach, and how, what and how much they should study, the right conduct of public worship, the right exercise of discipline, how to reprove and how to comfort, and very much more of the same sort, is set forth in due order. But of that complex, difficult department, which, with the growing complexity of society and the widening field of Christian labor, grows more and more important, viz.: the administration of the Church as an army or body of workers, the drill of its members, the

mapping out of the field of service, the development of its powers and capacities, the Doctor has no more to say than that "ministerial duty demands prudence or discretion." But he is not alone in this silence. The writers on Pastoral and Practical Theology do little more than hint at this side of the pastor's work. The Professors in our Theological Seminaries touch the matter very lightly; or, mostly, not at all. Such accomplished men as Phelps, of Andover, and Shedd, of Union, told us who sat in their classes, very little of how to manage an impracticable council, what to do for the development of the young members, how to direct and sustain the liberality of the Church, in what way to draw out and put to use the varied gifts of prayer, speech, skill and accomplishments, that lie in every congregation, as far as all use is concerned, pretty much as ore lies in the mine and granite in the quarry.

We were taught the tools, and their several uses, but not the use of the whole. We learned how to interpret Scripture, and how to square our system of theology; we had rules and theories for fashioning sermons, could examine a candidate for church-membership, and defend the faith once delivered to the saints; we had abundance of Church History down to within fifty years of our own time, and Greek and Hebrew without end. But we would have been puzzled to know what to do with a refractory choir, and dumb-founded if called on to organize a church's forces for aggressive work or even social edification. We had a vast deal of science, but no philosophy.

Imagine a young navigator put on his first ship with abundance of knowledge of astronomy, of tides and winds and currents, of geography and hydrology, but with no theory of navigation, and so left to frame his general principles into a method that he may sail his ship by as best he can, and you have the position of a young minister launched in his first congregation. Here are his materials: young members to be trained, the inactive to be aroused, the benevolence of the church to be organized, the gifts and talents and skill lying

unused, or only abused, to be adapted and harmonized, the latent force evolved, the means of edification, music, social meetings, special activities to be put into gear and used for the steady growth of the Church—and he, without so much as a manual or barest outline of theory to guide him. He has hardly been taught to surmise that there is any such side to his work. The ideal ground-sketch of his ministry, as he has drawn it, has in it a pulpit, a study, a closet, a prayer-meeting, a protracted meeting, and all the rest blank.

It is becoming more and more manifest that the power of the ministry, in the future, is to be one of two very distinct orders. The minister who sways men, must be either a great orator, or an administrator. The gift of leadership, organization, administration, or whatever it may be called, is possessed in all degrees of excellence, and is proportionately influential in the ministerial office, whether that degree be great or small. But it is not so as regards the gift of speech. The time is fast passing away in which moderate abilities in the pulpit can insure their proportionate share of success. A writer in one of our religious journals, the Boston Congregationalist, I think it is, avers that the most flourishing and popular churches of our great cities, are fast becoming mere religious lecture-associations, whose only real bond of cohesion is the pulpit power of the preacher. The congregation is associated for the support of a religious teacher, and they come together once or twice a week to listen to his instruction and be charmed with his eloquence, or poetry, or magnetism, or whatever it is in him that pleases. Another religious journal points to the significant fact that "Church-going has come to be looked upon, for the most part, as a Sunday entertainment; and whoever can furnish the best entertainment, is the most successful preacher;" and affirms, that while "there are certain eminent preachers who are able to maintain large congregations, by their power as orators and scholars, it is an undoubted fact, which nearly the whole religious press is deploring, that ordinary men no longer have the encouragement and support they formerly had in the ministry." From all this it is inferred that, "unless some change is ef-

fected, or some reaction takes place, the ministry will lose the little power it now has, and will fail of support as a distinct class."

There is in this the grain of truth that makes all falsehoods, that are influential at all, effective. Without question, while such men as Robertson and Spurgeon, in England, Beecher and Murray, Storrs and Wadsworth, in America, can still make the pulpit, naked and unaided, a battery of incalculable power, it is true, and steadily growing more evidently true, that mere ordinary ability, the gifts of mediocrity in the pulpit, are failing to secure a hearing. The gospel is none the less effective when heard, but the agencies of the press, the popular platform, the rapid rush of events, the clash of the political arena, the life of the wide world itself, photographed and brought by steam and telegraph daily to every man's fireside, drown the feeble voice. The daily and weekly press preach, and they preach a great deal of gospel, too; the schools preach; art preaches; science preaches; the very sweep of history, as it has been daily unfolding itself under our eyes in the late war and in the great conflict just abating in Europe, preaches—and it must be a clarion voice that can make itself heard distinctly above all these. The minister who expects to sway men by his utterances alone, must be a prophet indeed. So that Bushnell's saying, "he who is strong only in the pulpit, will be a weak minister of the gospel," is true enough of the most of us who preach. To be a strong preacher only, unless one is strong as only one in a thousand can be, is really to be a very weak minister of God.

This looks as if the power of the ministry were doomed. But there is a new field opening. A new chapter is to be written in the history of the Church. With the possibilities that are beginning to open through the agencies of lay work, in the organization and marshaling of the gifts, powers and training of the whole mass of the Church, a new phase of ministerial influence seems to be emerging. The preacher may grow less, but the pastor, or administrator, will grow more.

In the Homeric battles, the success of a chieftain depended on what he could achieve by his own strength and valor. But the generals of a modern battle scarcely know the manual of arms, or lift a sword. They are strong not by what they do themselves, but by what they organize and direct others to do. Moltke does not kindle one's enthusiasm as Achilles, but he certainly accomplishes more of the sort of work that war was meant to accomplish. The overseer of the flock, in the Church of the future, will do more for Christ than the mere preacher.

The Methodist Church is the chief religious power in this country. But it is not the eloquence or preaching power of her ordained ministers, that is gathering and swaying the masses, for there is nothing extraordinary in the generality of Methodist pulpits; it is in her spirit of organization, her economy of use of all the gifts and material in her membership, that the magic lies. Men laugh at her local preachers, and fastidious Methodists are very shy of their ministrations, but the local preacher has been the right arm of Methodism, and he is only one of the fruits of her spirit of organization.

Newman Hall preaches in Surrey Chapel, where Rowland Hill, a man of ten times his pulpit power, once preached; but the work done for Christ by Newman Hall, is tenfold greater than that wrought by his eloquent predecessor. He preaches through the organization that he has developed and inspires and administers; through his Benevolent Society, relieving the sick poor at their dwelling, and reaching eight hundred cases yearly, through his Christian Instruction Society visiting all the neighborhood with tract distribution, his Dorcas and Female Clothing Societies for poor women, his School of Industry for the training of neglected girls, his Sunday School Society, with its four hundred and seventeen teachers, his open-air meetings and lodging-house prayer-meetings, conducted by laymen, his popular week-lectures and musical entertainments for the working classes, his Young Men's Christian Association—through all of which it is calculated that not less than two hundred thousand are annually brought under the influence of Christianity. Now, it

is true that this is an eminent instance of the power of the minister as organizer and administrator. But conceive once what the influence of Newman Hall would be if his strength were solely, or mainly, in the pulpit. Shear away from him the organizing, administering work which has made Surrey Chapel such a camp of Christian forces, and then, by the contrast, learn what might be the efficiency in his sphere, and according to his opportunities and capacities, of the minister who now is putting the best of his strength and hope into his pulpit work.

But is this not equivalent to giving up the great enginery for the propagation of the truth and the conversion of the world, on which the Church has been taught to rely? Is it not by "the foolishness of preaching," that God is pleased to save them that believe? There are two views to be taken of preaching. We may look at it, on the one hand, as it appeared when the apostles came forth with the story of the cross and the resurrection. Then it was a proclamation of a new series of facts, a new revelation of God to men. We who live in this land of thronging churches, can never look for such a hearing, or such an effect, as attended that first proclamation. The very air we breathe is impregnated with Christian influences. We grow up into a state of society, and come by inheritance into an atmosphere of moral feeling, that make impossible to us that dewy freshness and resurrection, as it were, with which the gospel came to the first converts. True, there occur convulsions of society, and in personal experience, which temporarily bring back the likeness of those early circumstances. When seasons of deep and great revival roll their vast waves over the community, as in the work at Richmond, Indiana, a few years ago, and as we saw it in the Eastern part of Ohio last winter, specially manifest in the quickening of the churches of Dayton and Cincinnati, and more wondrous still, as in the truly apostolic awakening that is just closing in Cape Breton Island,—at such seasons, there passes over a community an influence that obliterates, for the time, the numbing effect of familiarity, and brings out what has grown stale and common as a new

revelation. Then the simple preaching of the gospel is seen to bring forth the old results.

But these are exceptional experiences in the history of any modern Christian community. As a distinguished divine said lately, "the propagating period of Christianity is comparatively passing away, and with that is passing away the interest of the former novelty, which always subsides in the order of development: * * if, as is perhaps the case, the Christian Church is not so enthusiastic, and has not so much of the propagating spirit, as it had at former periods, one reason is that it is so large, so full, and so rich, and has so much to consider, that it cannot expend itself as a motive force, as much as it once could. It is obliged now to distribute itself as an administrative force." Such a period of development and administration brings us round to another view of this matter of preaching as it is related to the work of the Church in the conversion of the world.

What is the purpose of the preacher of to-day, as he mounts his pulpit Sunday after Sunday? It is a mere farce, and something not far from a piece of solemn falsifying, to profess, as he looks on the familiar faces of his congregation, that he comes to bring them a new message, a fresh revelation from God. He comes as a teacher who has long since got past the novelties, and the stimulus of novelty, in his message. If he is to do his work naturally and honestly, he must propose, as for the substance of his teaching, to unfold and apply these familiar principles of truth to the lives and daily duties of the men before him.

The author of "Ecce Homo" in the midst of a vast deal of rubbish and mere fantasy, has drawn a picture of the minister in his pulpit, that is worth looking at in this connection. "Those who meet within the church-walls on Sunday, should not meet as strangers who find themselves together in the same lecture-hall, but as co-operators in a public work, the object of which all understand, and to his own department, of which each man habitually applies his mind and contriving power. Thus meeting, with the *esprit de corps* strong among them, and with a clear perception of the pur-

pose of their meeting, they would not desire that the exhortation of the preacher should be, what, in the nature of things, it seldom can be, eloquent. It might cease then to be either a despairing and overwrought appeal to the feelings, which grow more callous the oftener they are thus excited to no definite purpose, or a discussion of some deep point in morality or divinity better left to philosophers. It might then become weighty with business, and impressive as an officer's address to his troops before a battle. For it would be addressed by a soldier to soldiers, in the presence of an enemy whose character they understood, and in the war with whom they had given and received telling blows. It would be addressed to an ardent and hopeful association, who had united for the purpose of contending, within a given district, against disease and distress, of diminishing the rudeness, ignorance and imprudence of the poor, and the heartlessness and hardness of the rich, * * for the purpose of providing a large and wise education for the young; lastly, for the purpose of handing on the story of Christ's life, death and resurrection, maintaining the enthusiasm of humanity in all the baptized, and preserving, in opposition to all temptations, the filial freedom of their worship of God."

This is a highly colored picture of the probable condition of activity in any of our churches, and also a very narrow and inadequate sketch of the range of Christian work; but do we not see in it an outline of the direction in which the pulpit work of the minister ought to be? If from the field of labor where he has been planning, guiding, leading, his people as a working body, he can come to the pulpit as to a rostrum from which to instruct, inspire, reprove, restrain, cheer his church with direct reference to the work that is before them, then there will be no need of eloquence or great power of speech. A leader is always eloquent to those he leads. An administrator is mighty in speech to his co-workers, because he is leading and they are following in one common labor. The work preaches.

Clearly, I think, the business of preaching in a settled church, and for a man of ordinary power, is not chief, but

subordinate. If, as pastors, we can find something for every man to do, can mark out each one's place, and rouse an individual interest in specific Christian work, we shall have no trouble in finding interested hearers. But simply to preach from Sunday to Sunday to a people, as one lectures to a lyceum, with no other immediate objective point than to say something fresh and stirring, is of all work the most depressing. It is no wonder that the modern minister is ever seeking some new place. There is nothing in the way of means that can freshen the pulpit like bringing it into direct contact with the co-operative work of the pews. The organizing, abministrative preacher, will never be dull to his co-laborers; and his work with them, and through them, will most rapidly increase the number of those who, from an interest in the work of Christ, will find an interest in the word of Christ.

We may enter more into the detail of the administrative work of the pastor in another paper.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The new year has opened with no indications of any unusual literary activity. The general dulness of trade has, to some extent, affected the book business. Publishers seem reluctant to engage in new enterprises, and many manuscripts, it is said, are rejected. Still, a fair number of new books have been issued, and important works have been given to the public.

A fact worthy of notice, as possessing literary significance, is seen in the large re-issue, for some time past, of new editions of old and standard books. This appears in the book lists of both English and American houses. In 1870, English publishers issued 3,377 wholly new books, and 1,279 new editions of old works. This indicates not only healthy taste, but a steady growth of the permanent literature of the various departments of thought and truth. Amid much that is ephemeral, many works of abiding value are produced. The permanent treasures of discussion are enlarged and enriched. Every well selected library must include a large share of old works—works whose value is demanding their re-issue in new editions.

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological.—Among the works of special importance and value, are *The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, by Prof. Gess, of Tübingen; another edition of *Lightfoot's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; The Revelation of St. John*, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, by Rev. Henry Cowles, D. D.; and a new edition of *The Rock of Ages;* or Scripture testimony to the one Eternal Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by Rev. Edward H. Bickersteth, M. A.

From Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Edinburg, Scribner, Welford & Co. have published, in this country, some most valuable works: Dr. Delitzsch's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews;* Dr. Christian F. Schmid's *Biblical Theology of the New Testament; The Doctrine* of *the Atonement*, as taught by the Apostles, or the Sayings of the Apostles Exegetically expounded, by Rev. George Smeaton, D. D.; *The leading Christian Evidences* and the Principles on which to Estimate them, by Gilbert Wardlaw, M. A.

In *The Miracles of our Lord*, by George Macdonald, LL. D., published by Lippincott & Co., is offered another discussion on an important subject.

The admirers of Dr. James Hamilton of London, will be glad to read a posthumous volume, entitled, *Moses, the Man of God*, consisting of Lectures delivered by him, and published by Robert Carter & Bros.

Dr. Macduff appears in a new volume, *Memories of Patmos;* or Some of the great Words and Visions of the Apocalypse—a series of practical expositions of select passages, intended for the development of the Christian llfe.

D. Appleton & Co. have issued an American Edition of *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, noticed among British books in the last number.

A new work by Dr. Asa Mahan, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, is published by W. C. Palmer, Jr., N. York.

In *Science and the Bible*, by Rev. Herbert W. Morris, formerly Professor of Mathematics in Newington Collegiate Institution, from the press of Ziegler & M'Curdy, we are furnished with an excellent popular discussion of the Six Day's work of Creation, in the light of the latest facts of Science.

The Hulsean Lectures for 1870, *The Witness of History to Christ*, by Rev. F. W. Farrar, A. M·, are published by Macmillan & Co. N. York.

The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, by Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth, is announced as "still" in press.

Scientific and Philosophical.—Some of the noticeable books in this department are, *Body and Mind*, An Inquiry into their Connection and Mutual Influence, specially in reference to Mental Disorders, by Henry Maudsley; Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Psychology*, Parts III and IV,

published by D. Appleton & Co.; *The Laws of Fermentation*, and the Wines of the Ancients, by Rev. William Patton, D. D., from the press of the National Temp. Society and Pub. House, N. York; and the first vol. of Darwin,s *Descent of Man, and Selection in relation to Sex*, unfolding his well-known Development Theory.

The Genesis of Species, by George Mivart, is a reply to Darwin, and an important contribution to the literature of the subject, from the house of Macmillan & Co.

The enterprising house of Porter & Coates, is about to issue a *facsimile* edition of Wilson's American Ornithology.

Historical and Biographical.—A valuable addition to History has been made in two volumes, entitled *A Manual of the Ancient History of the Israelites, Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians, Phœnicians and Arabians*, by Francis Lenormant and E. Chevallier, translated from the French, and published by J. B. Lippincott & Co. *A Manual of Ancient History*, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire, by George Rawlinson, needs no other guarantee for its accuracy and value than the name of its learned author. Dr. Austin Allibone's great and valuable work, *Critical Dictionary* of *English Literature, and British and American Authors*, has been completed in the appearance of the third volume. Soms other books of this class, are Abbott's *History* of *Louis* XIV; *Roman Imperialism, and other Lectures and Essays*, by J. R. Seeley, M. A., author of Ecce Homo; *A Hand-Book* of Legendary and Mythological Art, by Clara Erskine Clement; an American edition of the third volume Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop;* the first volume of Curtius' *History* of *Greece;* the second volume of Lippincott's valuable *Pronouncing Dictionary* of *Biography and Mythology*, Edited by Dr. J. Thomas, completing the work; *The Life and Letters* of *Hugh Miller*, by Peter Baine, 2 vols.; and *The Life and Works* of *Lessing*, translated from the German of Adolf Stahr, by E. P. Evans, Ph. D. Prof. in the University of Michigan.

General Literature.—Jas. R. Osgood & Co., have published a new and attractive volume of Essays, by Prof. Lowell, entitled *My Study Windows. Mountains* of *the Unseen*, a new volume of Poems by Jean Ingelow, will give delight to the readers of poetry. Porter & Coates of Philadelphia have published new and enlarged additions of Longfellow's *Poets and Poetry* of *Europe*, Hedge's *Prose Writers* of *Germany*, and Griswold's *Pross Writers* of *America*—noticed in this number.

BRITISH.

Among the Theological books worthy of notice, are mentioned, *The Problem* of *Evil*, by Professor Naville of Geneva; a *Commentary on Isaiah*, by Rev. T. R. Birks; Bishop Wordworth's *Commentary on the Book* of *Daniel; The Active Powers* of *the Mind in relation to Religion*, by Rev. N. Bishop; *Homilies on Ethnic Inspiration*, by Rev. J. T. Goodsir; a new

work, entitled, *The Creator and Creation*, by Dr. John Young, author of "The Christ of History."

Of *Biographical and Historical*, are *The Life and Times* of *Lord Brougham*, by himself; *Life and Labors* of St. Thomas Aquinas, by Dr. R. B. Vaughan; and a *History* of *Rome*, by Wm. Ihne.

The North British Review has been discontinued after a properous existence of twenty-six years. No reason is assigned. This has been among the 'Four Foreign Reviews' reprinted in this country by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, of New York. The Company have selected the British Quarterly Review to supply its place. It is a good selection.

GERMAN.

THE GERMAN QUARTERLIES.

However much the Franco-Prussian war may have interfered with the publication of theological works on the continent of Europe, the German theological Quarterlies are filled, as usual, with scholarly articles. The oldest of these is the "*Studien und Kritiken*," which was established in 1828, by Ullmann and Umbreit. During the forty-two years of its existence, men like Schleiermacher, Neander, Nitzsch, Twesten, Tholuck, and Dorner, have made it the repository of some of their best thoughts. As both of its founders are dead, it is now edited by Drs. C. B. Hundeshagen and E. Riehm, assisted by Drs. S. Müller, W. Beyschlag, and J. Köstlin. The first number of 1871, opens with an article by Dr. J. Köstlin, entitled, "Historical Investigations concerning Luther's life before the dispute on indulgences." The year of Luther's birth is not known with absolute certainty. Immediately after his death, the opinions of his friends were divided between the years 1483 and 1484. Melanchthon, who decides in favor of the former, asked Luther's mother about the time of his birth. Her reply was that she remembered the day and hour distinctly, but not the year. The year 1483 has, however, the strongest arguments in its favor. A more interesting question than the time of his birth, is that respecting the causes which led him into the cloister. Besides his inner struggles, there were two circumstances which had much to do with his decision to become a monk; one was the death of a young friend, and the other a fearful thunderstorm. But the name of the friend is unknown. Köstlin thinks he was called Alexius, because on the day of St. Alexius Luther entered the cloister. Nor is the manner of his death known; the story that he was struck down during the thunderstorm mentioned above, is mere fiction.

The second article discusses "The Principles of modern thought in their application to Christianity," by Dr. Meuss, Prof. of Theol. in Breslau, and is a reply to an anonymous article in a former number on "Christianity and modern Culture." Dr. M. defends Christianity against the attacks of modern speculation and materialism.

Besides reviews of several book, there is an exegetical article of forty pages on Eph. 4 : 7—16.

The "*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie,*" is, as its name indicates, devoted entirely to historical theology, and is edited by Dr. K. F. A. Kahnis, in connection with the historico-theological Society of Leipzig. Its first article is by Rev. C. F. Köhler, on "Gotfried Arnold," a man concerning whose merits the most conflicting opinions have prevailed, and whose celebrated work on "The History of the Church and Heresy," (Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie) has been as immoderately praised by some as it was censured by others. The author places him among the men through whose inflence the mission work among the heathen was begun, and a new impulse was given to benevolent and domestic mission work at home. On the Lutheran Church he produced a beneficial and lasting effect.

Dr. Friedberg, Professor in Leipzig, contributes an article on the "History of the Interim and of the Agenda in Saxony in 1549." Besides these, there are learned articles on "Dionysius the Great, of Alexandria," by Th. Förster; "Asterius, Bishop of Amasea," by Dr. L. Koch; and "Tertullian as a source for Christian Archæology," by Rev. R. Leimbach.

The "*Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*" was founded by Drs. Rudelbach and Guericke, thirty-one years ago. As the former of these died recently, this Quarterly is now edited by Drs. F. Delitzsch and H. E. F. Guericke. Dr. D. is well known in this country through his exegetical works on the Old Testament, and the latter through his Church History. Dr. G. has for many years been Theol. Prof. in Halle, but has never been made Prof. in ordinary, because he has so persistently opposed the union of Lutherans and Reformed into one State Church in Prussia and other lands. The Quarterly is the organ of what, in this country, would be called symbolists; it opposes the union in Prussia, advocates the separation of the Lutherans from that union, and their organization into a Lutheran Church independent of the state. The most important article in the first number of this year, is by Theo. Schott, on "The Nature of Baptism according to the words of the institution," (nach den Einsetzungsworten). Already in the words of the institution of baptism, Matt. 28 : 18—20, the author finds "all the essential elements of the evangelical Lutheran doctrine of baptism."

The importance attached to the review of books, is evident from the fact that while only seventy-six pages are devoted to original articles, one hundred and forty are devoted to critical notices and reviews of books, some thirty-nine books being reviewed. This department is systematically arranged under the following heads: Patrology, Exegetical Theology, Church History, Ecclesiastical Law and Polity, Symbolical and Catechetical Theology, Christian Ethics, Pastoral Theology, Homiletical and Ascetic works, and books related to Theology. The great stress laid on exe-

getical studies in Germany, is one of the most hopeful signs of that land of thought. In this number fourteen new exegetical works are reviewed; three on the Psalms, five on Daniel, and the rest on the New Testament. The severe attacks of the negative criticism on Daniel, are the occasion of the extensive modern literature on that subject. Of the prophets, Daniel has been most severely attacked by modern skepticism, just as John among the evangelists. Of the historical works reviewed, the most important is the "History of French Calvinism," (German) by G. von Polenz. This is the result of vast research and many years of labor. The history comes down to the year 1789, and is in five volumes. The author, who died a few months ago, himself has a history full of interest. When a boy he ran away from school; he chose the profession of arms, and became a major in the Saxon army; he never studied theology, but his work necessarily embraces much theological matter, and takes a high rank among historical works in Germany; in recognition of his services to theology, the University of Breslau did him the very unusual honor of conferring on him, a layman and a soldier, the title of Doctor of Divinity. He wrote for various theological journals of Germany, and also articles in Herzog's Encyclopædie. He was very liberal in his views, intimate with Tholuck, a warm friend of America and of Americans that visited Halle. A few years ago he lost by death a daughter, a son, and a son-in-law; and just before his death, the only remaining child, a daughter. He looked upon French Calvinism as reaching its culmination in Puritanism, and was desirous of having his history supplemented by a history of Puritanism; and shortly before his death he wrote to a Lutheran minister in this country, expressing the wish that he would write such a history.

In this number, Dr. Guericke, in a short article, argues strongly in favor of the absolution every Sunday after the morning sermon, as after the sermon, which awakens the sense of sinfulness, the need of absolution is felt more than at the beginning of the service.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

Illustration of Scripture Precepts, for the Young, translated from the French of Mlle. Couriard (for the S. S. Society of Paris), by Mrs. E. B. Stork, First and Second Series.

These two beautiful volumes have been prepared on the plan of illustrating Scripture truths and precepts, by short and interesting stories, adapt-

ed to the minds of children. The stories are not all of equal merit, but they will help to impress the divine teaching on the mind. The books are gotten out in very attractive style, and should secure a wide circulation.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

THE PROSE WRITERS OF AMERICA, by Rufus W. Griswold, with a Supplement by Prof. J. H. Dillingham.

The first edition of this work was issued in 1847. Like all compilations, it is open to criticism in its selection of names and productions. Such studies are necessarily elective in their character. Where authors are numbered by thousands, any attempt to give an exhaustive presentation of our literature in this form, would be useless. While the selections, for the most part, are judicious, and give us an enlarged conception of American literature, we cannot appreciate the taste which has guided in some of the admissions and rejections. It is a "fearful coming down" to begin with Jonathan Edwards, and close with Dewitt Talmage. Why are such names as George Washington and John Witherspoon omitted? The Valedictory Counsels of the one, and the Essay on Paper Money by the other, are classics in our language. Several pages are allotted to Andrew Jackson Downing, the Gardener, while we search in vain for a paragraph even, from the gifted pen of Charles Sumner. Albert Barnes and George Bush are "representative prose writers," but not Dr. Bacon, or Dr. Bethune, or Wendell Phillips. We notice these features, not to find fault with the selection, but in doubt as to the principle which guided the compilers. The volume is one of great value, and should find a place in every well selected library. The work is issued in the finest style, and reflects great credit on the House which has put it out. Our attention has frequently been turned, of late, to the publications of Porter and Coates, and their works are rapidly advancing them to the very first rank among American publishing houses.

PROSE WRITERS OF GERMANY, by Frederic H. Hedge, illustrated with portraits. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. pp. 580.

The design of this delightful work, which, in earlier editions, has been before the public since 1847, is to present a characterizing, though not a complete exhibition of the prose literature of Germany. In view of the impossibility of representing, in adequate specimens, the vast body of writers of that literary nation, the compiler has made such a "selection" as would, in his judgment, afford a true idea of its many-sided literature. The work has been well done. It gives us samples, of varied length, from twenty-nine authors, in the different departments of thought and writing—in Theology, Philosophy, and general letters. The list begins, as it should, with Luther, who is justly regarded as the creator of German literature. He, more than any other man, became the leader and representatlve of the intellectual life of the nation—quickening it into free activity, and im-

pressing it with permanent forms. The short, but appreciative notice of his life, which opens the book, repeats the statement which attributes to him the couplet:

> "Wer nicht liebt Wein, Weiber und Gesang,
> Der bleibt ein Narr sein Lebenlang."

It should be remembered, however, that this is without critical authority from Luther's works. The personal sketches of the lives of the different authors, are genial, and, for the most part, discriminating. The specimens are ample enough to show their distinguishing characteristics. As affording to the English-reading public a glimpse of the thought of that nation which has produced the richest and most abundant literature of the world, this book is one of great interest and value. Its intrinsic worth fully justifies the publishers in bringing it out in this new edition, in the substantial and elegant style in which it appears.

THE POETS AND POETRY OF EUROPE, with Introductions and Biographical Notices, By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. A new Edition, Revised and Enlarged.

The appearance of this fine Edition of *The Poets and Poetry* of *Europe*, illustrates the permanence of a true literary work. "With very few exceptions," says a recent writer, "the fact of a book having passed the age of twelve months, is sufficient to banish it from polite society." This is probably overstated; but whether it is or not, this book is a plain "exception" to the supposed mortality of the issues of the press. From its first publication in 1845, it has maintained a place as a standard work of the class to which it belongs. The work has been enlarged in this edition, by by a supplement embracing specimens from over sixty additional authors, and including many gems of beauty.

The plan of the compiler has been to "bring together, into a compact and convenient form, as large amount as possible of those English translations which are scattered through many volumes, and are not accessible to the general reader." The materials are viewed historically, rather than critically. They are arranged according to their dates, and meant to give as perfect an idea of the poetical literature of modern Europe as can be gained from the rhythmical translations available. Hence "the work is to be regarded as a collection, rather than as a selection," many pieces being included, not so mnch for their poetic merit, as to illustrate the poetry of the age and nation to which they belong. The translations are from ten different languages, and nearly seven hundred authors. In the varied specimens gathered from this broad and wealthy field, we are supplied with the means of gaining a connected view, and one as complete as can be obtained without a knowledge of the original tongues, of the poetical literature of Europe. The sketches of the national language and literature of the different countries, and the biographical notices of authors, form a feature of great interest and value.

We are glad to call attention to this new and handsome edition. It is a volume that will continue, in the future, as has done in the past, to afford gratification to cultivated taste, and instruction to inquiring minds. Published in uniform style with *Hedge's Prose Writers* of *Germany* and *Griswold's Prose Writers* of *America*, it deserves, with them, a place among "standard works," in all well-selected libraries.

DE WITT C. LENT & COMPANY, NEW YORK.

PRESBYTERIAN RE-UNION MEMORIAL VOLUME, 1837—1871. pp. 568.

This large and very interesting volume is a fitting *memorial* of a great event in the history of the Presbyterian Church, and, indeed, of the Christianity of our land. The General Assembly divided in 1837, and became two bodies, known as the Old and New School General Assemblies, but after a separation of more than thirty years, these two bodies have happily reunited, and are now enjoying all the glow and excitement of such a consummation. The work of reunion was gradual, but, as it progressed, surmounted every barrier, until those who had been opposed, or stood in doubt, were compelled to glorify God for what He had wrought. November 12th, 1869, in the city of Pittsburg, the reunion was completed—and the scene was one that will be forever memorable in the history of that Church.

The volume that is designed to commemorate this event, is made up of contributions from the pens of a number of leading men, representing both parties as they formerly existed, and embraces historical reviews, biographical sketches, proposals and plans of union, speeches, statistics, documents, etc, etc. Whilst the subject is of primary and chief interest to Presbyterians, it cannot fail to interest all who are concerned about the peace and welfare of the Church of Christ. Some of the speeches are of thrilling interest, and some of the scenes described have few parallels in any age of the Church.

This reunion among Presbyterians may have some lessons for others. One of these lessons is, how the spirit of Christian love will overcome real and imaginary difficulties, and find for itself a way of action. The various plans of adjustment, involving pledges and compromises, all gave way to a hearty, confidential union on the simple basis of the Confession they all received. Neither party professed to receive the ipsissima verba of the Confession. Both allowed some degree of liberty in its subscription. And yet both adhered to it as 'containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' It is not too much to say that the reunion never could have been effected on the basis of perfect agreement in "every statement of doctrine." On both sides, or on all sides, liberty was insisted on, and the happy result only accomplished by the exercise of Christian charity. With acknowledged differences of views on some points, they all came together, "each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body, according to the principles of the Confession common to both."

This example among Presbyterians might be studied with profit by Lutherans.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK,

Through Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

From the enterprising house of Carter & Bros., distinguished by their choice and valuable publications, we have received a number of smaller volumes, which add to the stock of religious reading. The most noticeable of these volumes is,

THE LORD'S PRAYER, by Henry J. Van Dyke, D. D., pp. 194.

This neat and substantial volume, consists of eight chapters, or discourses, on this inimitable prayer of our Lord, with an Introduction touching on its use as a form and model of prayer. The discourses are characized by simplicity, and an earnest presentation of sound religious truth. There is no aim at anything startling or very striking, but there is much wholesome food for those who love God's truth. Notwithstanding the many commentaries and discourses on our Lord's Prayer, there is no danger that the subject will ever grow old or stale. We have noticed, what seems to us, one inadvertent error in this judicious author. He says, page 15: "In the Old Testament God is nowhere addressed as our Father; except in the single passage where the evangelical prophet, in anticipation of the coming Messiah, breaks forth in the exclamation: 'Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer.'" In the very next chapter of Isaiah, we have "*But now, O Lord, thou art our Father.*" And as the remark turns on "*Father*," and not on "*our*," the Old Testament furnishes numerous examples of addressing God as Father. "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation." "Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, My Father, thou art the pride of my youth?" "Thou shalt call me, My Father; and shalt not turn away from me." "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise? Is not He thy Father that hath bought thee?" The fatherhood of God, though bronght out and illustrated in the New Testament, is not unknown in the Old.

The moderation and conservatism of this volume, is worthy of special notice. Dr. Van Dyke belongs to a Church that largely or entirely discards forms of prayer, and yet we find him saying, "The Lord's Prayer is both a form and a model. As a form it is equally adapted to private and to public worship. It ought to be taught to little children among the first lessons of devotion. But it should not be put aside with childish things. No degree of intelligence or fervor can render it unsuitable. It ought to be repeated at the family altar and in the public assemblies of the Church." It would be very unfair to cite Dr. Van Dyke as an advocate

of regular and full liturgical services, against "those who prefer the more free and pliable forms of worship," yet we may cite him as an illustration of a large and catholic spirit against the narrowness and bigotry that take offence at even repeating in worship the words of our blessed Lord.

The Two Brothers, and other Poems, by Edward Henry Bickersteth, pp. 324,

Though containing some beautiful and touching scenes, will not greatly enhance the reputation of the author of "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever."

Frank Austin's Diamond, pp. 196, and Eagle Crag, pp. 202

Of the Drayton Hall Series, are good books for boys.

Opportunities, a Sequel to What She Could, pp. 382, by the same author,

Is an intermediate volume followed by "The House in Town." An interesting volume for our young readers.

Home Religion, by the Rev. W. B. Mackenzie, M. A., pp. 136,

Is a small and instructive volume on a most important subject.

Lonely Lily, by M. L. C. Fireside Library, No. 4, pp., 110.

A most interesting little story, showing the way of Christ's grace, with the old and young.

The Broken Bud, by a bereaved mother, pp. 325,

Is a sorrowing mother telling the touching story of her own bereavement.

Belle Powers' Locket, by Joanna H. Matthews, pp. 242,

What Shawny Did to the Light House, by S. J. Pritchard, pp. 144, and

Daisy Maynard's Four Promises, pp. 188,

Are entertaining books for girls.

The Babe at the Wedding, and other narratives, pp. 252, and

The Bag of Blessings, and other narratives, pp. 252, by Rev. P. B. Power, A. M., author of "I Wills of the Psalms, etc,"

Contain interesting stories for the young.

We cordially commend the publications of Carter & Bros., as among the very safest and best to be put into the hands of youthful readers. The more substantial publications from the same house take rank among the best issues from the American press. The imprint of Carter & Bros. is a guarantee that the book is free from anything that is offensive to Christian sentiment, or dangerous to virtue and morality. Whilst the land is flooded with publications of a doubtful and dangerous character, it is matter of congratulation that so much is done to counteract the evil tendency, by works that have a different stamp.

A. D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

Culture and the Gospel; or a Plea for the Sufficiency of the Gospel to meet the wants of an enlightened age, by Rev. S. M'Call, pp. 123,

This volume, though small in size, is very rich and suggestive in thought, and of more value than many volumes of much larger size and

greater pretensions. The germ of the work was a "Concio ad clerum" preached in connection with the Commencement exercises of Yale College, July 2nd, 1869. It shows in a very happy and conclusive manner the adaptation of the Gospel to meet the demands of the highest culture, and the most advanced stage of progress. We are made to feel how grand and sublime is the mission of Christianity, and how mean compared with it are all the pretences of infidelity and "science falsely so called." The Gospel is its own best witness. We commend any who are tempted by the sounding words of science and philosophy, or by the pretences of an advanced culture to have outlived the old religion of the Gospel, to read this little volume. Such reading is bracing to the nerves and refreshing to the spirits, when wearied with the contradictions and failures—not of Christianity, but of the wisdom of this world.

CHARLES C. CHATFIELD & CO., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

A Text Book of Elementary Chemistry, Theoretical and Inorganic, by George F. Barker, M. D., Prof. of Physiological Chemistry in Yale College. Received from, and for sale by, J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Science of Chemistry has made remarkable progress within the last ten years. It has reached many new truths, and developed some new methods. These have been, for some time, accepted and employed in instruction by the most advanced chemists. This work of Prof. Barker is an effort to put the new method into the form of a manual for class-room instruction. "It aims to present the principles of the Science as they are held by the best chemists of the day," and represents the advanced stage it now occupies. It is a work that will rank among the very first, as a text book in its department, and supersede many of the inferior manuals now used in educational institutions.

On the Physical Basis of Life, by T. H. Huxley, LL. D., F. R. S. No. 1, University Series.

This "University Series" consists of Educational and Scientific Lectures, Addresses, and Essays, brought out in neat pamphlet form, of uniform style and price. They are issued, about one number a month—price 25 cents each.

This first is the well-known Lecture of Prof. Huxley on Protoplasm, representing all life and thought but as manifestations or phenomena of matter, in peculiar organization.

The Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces, by Prof. Geo. F. Barker, M. D., Yale College. No. 2, University Series.

A carefully written Essay, pressing the doctrine of the correlation of the physical forces, by unscientific combinations and influences, into the service of Huxley's materialism. It maintains, if we rightly understand it, that not only such things as heat, light, and motion, but *life* and *thought* are mere manifestations of physical force. In reading it, one cannot but be surprised at the immense assumptions and illogical conclusions

of the writer, where he advances beyond his facts and dogmatizes upon them. His reluctant concession to the Christian doctrine of the soul, at the close of the Essay, is an insult to the discrimination and logic of his readers. To profess to have shown that *thought*, the supposed characterizing function of the soul, is only a manifestation of physical force, a "part of the great ocean of energy" appearing "in multitude of forms," as light, and heat, and then to concede that we are still permitted to believe, on the authority of revelation, that we have a soul, robbed of its functions, is an excess of effrontery.

As Regards Protoplasm, in relation to Prof. Huxley's Essay on the Physical Basis of Life. By James Hutchison Stirling, F. R. S. and LL. D. Edinburg. No. 3, University Series.

The substance of this paper was delivered, as a lecture, at a Conversazione of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburg, in the Hall of the College, on the evening of the 30th of April last. It is an able scientific examination of Mr. Huxley's theory of a physical basis of life.

Mr. Stirling sums up the theory of Huxley in two propositions: 1. "That all animal and vegetable organisms are essentially alike in power, in form, and in substance; 2. That all vital and intellectual functions are but the properties of the molecular disposition and changes of the material basis (protoplasm) of which the animals and vegetables consist." He then shows, by a careful comparison of physiological science, especially as represented in the most advanced investigation in Germany, that Huxley is partial and unreliable in his statement of scientific facts. From this, he proceeds to show that his identification of life and thought with the molecular condition and changes of protoplasm, is entirely gratuitous and wholly unsustained. He proves, by a reference to "living," and "dead" protoplasm, that *life* is a "possession in excess" of the mere matter, or this "physical basis," and that *thought* depends on other than mere material factors.

The conclusion, though not the argument, of Mr. Stirling may be seen in the following extract:

"But, if inorganic elements as such are inadequate to account either for vital organization or the objective idea of design, much more are they inadequate, in the third place, to account for the subjective idea, for the phenomena of thought as thought. Yet Mr. Huxley tells us that thought is but the expression of the molecular changes of protoplasm. This he only tells us; this he does not prove. He merely says that, if we admit the functions of the lowest forms of life to be but 'direct results of the nature of the matter of which they are composed,' we must admit as much for the functions of the highest. We have not admitted Mr. Huxley's presupposition; but, even with its admission, we should not feel bound to admit his conclusion. In such a mighty system of differences, there are ample room and verge enough for the introduction of new motives. We can say here at once, in fact, that as thought, let its connection be what it may with, has never been proved to result from, organization, no improvement of the proof required will be found in protoplasm. No

one power that Mr. Huxley signalizes in protoplasm can account for thought. * * The proof for the absoluteness of thought, the subject, the mind, is, on its side, pretty well perfect. It is not necessary here, however, to enter into that proof at length. Before passing on, I may simply point to the fact that, if thought is to be called a function of matter, it must be acknowledged to be a function wholly peculiar and unlike any other. In all other functions, we are present to processes which are in the same sense physical as the organs themselves. So it is with lung, stomach, liver, kidney, where every step can be followed, so to speak, with eye and hand; but all is changed when we have to do with mind as the function of the brain. Then, indeed, as Mr. Huxley thought in his Physiology, we are admitted, as if by touch of Aladdin's lamp, to a world absolutely different and essentially new—to a world, on its side of the incommunicable cleft, as complete, entire, independent, self-contained, and absolutely *sui generis*, as the world of matter on the other side. It will be sufficient here to allude to as much as this, with special reference to the fact that, so far as this argument is concerned, protoplasm has not introduced any the very slightest difference. All the ancient reasons for the independence of thought as against organization, can be used with even more striking effect as against protoplasm."

Prof. Huxley bases much of his argument on the alleged *identity* and *convertibility* of protoplasm. On the supposed convertibility of it from one animal into another, in the way of food, he founds the conclusion that the functions of the highest, not less than of the lowest, are but the molecular manifestations of their common protoplasm. This convertibility Mr. Stirling denies, and adds, with much force:

"But a more important point is this, that the functions themselves remain quite apart from the alleged convertibility. We can neither acquire the functions of what we eat, nor impart our functions to what eats us. We shall not come to fly by feeding on vultures, nor they to speak by feeding on us. No possible manure of human brains will enable a cornfield to reason. But if functions are inconvertible, the convertibility of the protoplasm is idle. In this inconvertibility, indeed, functions will be seen to be independent of mere chemical composition. And that is the truth: for functions there is more required than either chemistry or physics."

The author's views of the results of Darwin's speculations, though helped by Huxley's supposed life-stuff, are thus indicated:

"Neither molecularists nor Darwinians, then, are able to level out the difference between organic and inorganic, or between genera and genera or species and species. The differences persist in spite of both; the distributed identity remains unaccounted for. Nor, consequently, is Mr. Darwin's theory competent to explain the objective idea by any reference to time and conditions. Living beings do exist in a mighty chain from the moss to the man; but that chain, far from founding, is founded in the idea, and is not the result of any mere natural *growth* of this into that. That chain is itself the most brilliant stamp, the sign-manual, of design. On every ledge of nature, from the lowest to the highest, there is a life that is *its*,—a creature to represent it, reflect it—so to speak, pasture on it. The last, highest, brightest link of this chain is man; the incarnation of thought itself, which is the summation of this universe."

The discussion makes very plain the fact that the apparent advance of

materialism is not in the strength of scientific facts, but in bolder assumptions, and confident dogmatism. It assures us of the truth of the admission of Prof. Tyndall: "The problem of the connection of the body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages."

On the Hypothesis of Evolution: Physical and Metaphysical. By Prof. Edward D. Cope. No. 4, University Series.

A feeble plea for an hypothesis without scientific foundation. The author follows Darwin in his ambition to prove his monkey blood. A few more such feats in Biblical exegesis, as are presented in this address, will go far toward entitling him to be regarded as successful.

Scientific Addresses, by Prof. John Tyndall, LL. D., F. R. S. Royal Institution. No. 5, University Series.

This number of the Series includes three Addresses. The first is *On the Methods and Tendencies of Physical Investigation;* the second, On *Haze and Dust*, and the third, *On the Scientific use of the Imagination.* They are marked by the boldness of thought and the grace of style for which the author is so well known.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Tom Brown at Oxford, by the Author of Tom Brown's School Days. With Illustration by Sydney P. Hall.

This is a cheap edition of this well known and popnlar book.

PAMPHLETS.

A Voice from the United States of America to the People of France. New York, Cushing, Bardua & Co.

Jubilee of the Sunday School of the Ev. Lutheran Church of Frederick, Md., September 25th, 1870. Historical Discourse by Dr. Diehl, and other Addresses.

Modern Liberality: A Discourse by Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Phila.

The Success of God's Work: Reformation Sermon, by Rev. G. D. Bernham, Wilmington, N. C.

The Church Book Explained, by Rev. J. Fry, Reading, Pa.

Report of the Pennsylvania State Temperance Union, 1870.

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article. Page.

I. The Theistic Argument from Final Causes,..... 166

II. Home Missionary Organization,..... 195
By Rev. M. Officer, York, Pa., Secretary of the Board of Home Missions.

III. The Proposed Religious Amendment to our National Constitution,..... 221
By Rev. L. A. Gotwald, Chambersburg, Pa.

IV. Union in the Lutheran Church,..... 241

V. The Intermediate State,..... 268
By Rev. J. B. Baltzly, A. M., Bucyrus, Ohio.

VI. The Assurance of Faith,..... 280
Translated from Chemnitz' Examen, by Rev. H. E. Jacobs, M. A., Professor in Pennsylvania College.

VII. The Pastor of the Future,..... 300
By Rev. C. A. Stork, M. A., Baltimore, Md.

VIII. Literary Intelligence,..... 308

IX. Notices of New Books,..... 313

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—General Literature.

BRITISH.

Biblical and Theological—Biographical and Historical.

GERMAN.

THE GERMAN QUARTERLIES.

"Studien und Kritiken"—"Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie"—"Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche."

NEW BOOKS.

Illustration of Scripture Precepts—The Prose Writers of America—Prose Writers of Germany—The Poets and Poetry of Europe—Presbyterian Re-union Memorial volume—The Two Brothers—Frank Austin's Diamond—Eagle Crag—Opportunities—Home Religion—Lonely Lily—The Broken Bud—Belle Power's Locket—What Shawny Did to the Light House—Daisy Maynard's Four Promises—The Babe of the Wedding—The Bag of Blessing—A Text Book of Elementary Chemistry—On the Physical Basis of Life—The Correlation of Vital and Physical Forces—As Regards Protoplasm—On the Hypothesis of Evolution—Scientific Addresses—Tom Brown at Oxford.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1871.

ARTICLE I.

FRANCE AND THE ALLIED POWERS AT WATERLOO.

By Prof. E. Ferrier, of Pennsylvania College.

The recent struggle in Europe has political, educational, and religious lessons of no ordinary interest. Great causes have been at work, which have eaten out the spirit of one of the proudest monarchies of modern times. The France of 1871, is not the France of 1814 and 1815. Saarbrück, Metz and Sedan sound oddly by the side of Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, and Wagram. The signal failure has not been accidental, but is the direct result of agencies which have been working for three generations in the heart of French society. No apology is needed for the somewhat detailed statement of that decisive conflict between France and the allied powers, on the plains of Belgium, in the early part of the century. It has not only an inherent interest, changing as it did the political map of Europe, but by exhibiting in marked contrast the proud and powerful France of the past, almost the arbiter among the European states, and Paris the centre of

civilization and arts, with the humiliated and distracted France of the present, we hope to make more prominent, in another article, the educational and political lessons which so deeply concern us.

In the month of February, 1815, delegates were assembled from the various European powers in a congress at Vienna. They had been called together to deliberate upon measures of international security and prosperity. The war, which had been carried on with such unmitigated violence for nearly a quarter of a century, had greatly deranged the previously existing social order and polity. It was hoped that the deliberations of this body would end in some effectual solution of the new problems, and a general settlement of the European states. On the 26th of that month, while this important body was in session, intelligence of the escape of Napoleon Bonaparte from Elba reached Vienna. The news produced the wildest commotion in the peace-congress. The fall of a thunderbolt in a brilliant circle assembled in the imperial ball-room, could not have excited greater consternation. All peace measures were at once abandoned. The cry, "to arms," ran from nation to nation like an electric current, and was responded to with a cheerfulness, which showed a determination to annihilate the common foe.

The congress declared that, "Bonaparte had destroyed the sole legal title to which his political existence is attached—that he had placed himself out of the pale of civil and social relations." This document, making Bonaparte the common foe of Europe and of man, was signed by Austria, Spain, France, England, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, and Sweden. Thus in this wide-spread movement for war, was verified that famous saying of Chateaubriand: "If the cocked hat and surtout of Napoleon were placed on a stick on the shores of Brest, it would cause Europe to run to arms from one end to the other." Russia, at that time, had two hundred and eighty thousand troops in Poland, which were held in readiness to march at a moment's warning. Alexander declared that he could throw into the crusade three hundred thousand men. Denmark and Sweden, forgetting their recent difficul-

ties, joined the general coalition, and even the Swiss ignored their ancient neutrality to take an active part in the strife. Thus at different points contiguous to the French frontier, by the end of May, it was found practicable to gather five hundred thousand men. The game was a tremendous one. Napoleon opened it. The stake was a crown, and the fate of France. By a bold and resolute advance into Belgium, he hoped to vanquish, in almost a single blow, the allied forces.

The Belgian frontier was assigned to the Duke of Wellington, and to a Prussian force under Marshal Blucher. Thus the post of honor was occupied by Great Britain and Prussia, who formed the vanguard of the mighty masses which Europe was pouring forth from the north and the west, to seal the Napoleonic dynasty. In this campaign, the like of which the world has seldom seen, it was well for the nations that the Duke of Wellington occupied so prominent a place. "He was the ideal of the British soldier. He possessed traits which distinguished him as one of the greatest captains that his own, or any other nation, ever produced." He detected the object of every hostile movement with the glance of an eagle. Resolute, cool, and calculating, he carried every measure into execution with marvelous promptitude. The presence of mind with which he surveyed a battle-field, and gave his orders in the most critical moment, are almost unexampled. His pre-eminent abilities, his experience and his character, all fitted him to lead the military array, assembled to decide the fate of Napoleon. Marshal Blucher, the commander of the Prussian army, was the worthy compeer of Wellington in this memorable campaign. Possessing a high-spirited daring in enterprise bordering on rashness, chivalrous, brave, impetuous, ever vigilant, he was a fit representative, and worthy leader of the Prussians.

As these five hundred thousand men gathered down on the frontier from the European states, moved as by a common impulse, France likewise, presented an appearance singularly warlike. The whole nation buckled on its armor. Armed bodies were in motion over the entire country. The arsenals, and all the manufactories of clothing, and articles of equip-

ment were in the greatest activity. Crowds of workmen were employed day and night in the repair of numerous fortresses, and in the erection of entrenched works. The whole nation, without a murmur of dissent, seemed to move forth with almost superhuman ardor and elasticity of spirit, inspired by the full confidence of a renewed career of victory, rejoicing in the display of those standards which so proudly recalled the most glorious fields France had ever won, and testifying by their acclamations, their enthusiastic devotion to the cause of Napoleon.

The French Emperor determined to take the field in person. Though so dauntless a character, this was an undertaking daring and perilous in the extreme. But desperate situations seemed to impart to his vigorous genius new elasticity. It would not be the first time that he had gone out against such fearful superiority of numerical strength. Only the year before, when almost surrounded by the victorious forces of Prussia, Austria and Russia, when apparently overwhelmed by a succession of disasters, and his army presented the merest wreck of its former self, he was in the very height of his mental energy, and in full possession of his all-subduing will. Napoleon, then, had a right to indulge hope in the issue of the approaching campaign, though he had not time to develop his resources more largely. A more gallant army never took the field. On the eve of opening the scene, Napoleon sent one of those appeals to his army, which were wont to stir the spirit of Frenchmen, more than the blast of a bugle: "Soldiers, this day is the anniversary of Marengo and Friedland, which twice decided the destiny of Europe. Leagued together, the thrones of Europe aim at the independence and the most sacred rights of France. Let us, then, march to meet them. Are they and we no longer the same men? Soldiers! at Jena, against these same Prussians, now so arrogant, you were one to three, and at Montmirail one to six. Soldiers! we have forced marches to make, battles to fight, dangers to encounter; but with firmness, victory will be ours. The rights, the honor, and the happiness of the

country will be recovered. To every Frenchman who has a heart, the moment is now arrived to conquer or to die."

Before the decisive issue was joined at Waterloo, two battles of a decisive character were fought, which had much to do with the selection of the ground on which Wellington and Napoleon were to gain or lose all which they held dear. Wellington gained a victory over the French at Quatre Bas, but Blucher was beaten at Ligny. In consequence, and to maintain connection with Blucher, Wellington fell back, and chose ground on which he resolved to test the matter decidedly with Napoleon. In the retreat from Ligny, Blucher narrowly escaped with his life. A newspaper correspondent gives us the incident. As Blucher was retiring before the French, his horse, a fine grey charger, and a present from the Prince Regent of England, was mortally wounded by a shot. The animal, still obedient to the impulse of its gallant master, made a few convulsive plunges forward; feeling that his steed was rapidly losing strength, Blucher cried to his aid-de-camp: "Nostitz, now I am lost." At that moment the horse fell from exhaustion, rolling upon its right side, and half-burying the rider under its weight. Count Nostitz immediately sprung from his saddle, and holding his bridle with his left hand, drew his sword, resolved to hazard his life in defence of his General. Scarcely had he done so, when the French came dashing forward. As it was twilight, and the French were moving with great rapidity, they failed to recognize Blucher and his aid, though they swept so closely by that one of them roughly brushed against Nostitz's horse.

As to the selection of Waterloo, it is a remarkable fact that Wellington had been for years familiar with the topography. The great Duke of Marlborough had once selected the same ground for a battlefield, and would have gained a decided victory, but for the stupid obstinacy of the Dutch field-commissioners. The English position was a strong one. Wellington occupied a gently elevated ridge, just in front of the village of Mount St. Jean. This village is at the intersection of two high roads, leading to Brussels from Charleroi and Newville. Among the French, the battle is

almost uniformly spoken of as the battle of Mount St. Jean, but the English have preferred the name of Waterloo, a small town some distance from the actual field of contest. The two high roads from Charleroi and Newville ran directly across the lines of Wellington. On the east side, the ridge extends itself perpendicularly from the Charleroi road, until it reaches a point, distant about seven hundred yards, where, elevating itself into a mound or knoll, it overlooks a hamlet, and thence taking a north easterly course, expands into an open plateau. The Duke of Wellington placed his first line on this strong position. It reminds one very strikingly of the position occupied by the Union forces at the battle of Gettysburg. The troops of Wellington were arranged in somewhat the same general manner. With the right centre resting on the Newville road, the right and left wings were drawn back, and well protected by artillery stationed at convenient points.

The French occupied an eminence just south of the English position. The ground on which the battle was fought can not at most exceed two miles from north to south, including the whole, from the rear of the British to the rear of the French position. This perhaps is something greater than the distance between the contending armies in the battle of Gettysburg. From east to west, from the extremity of the left to that of the right wing of the armies, is scarcely one mile and a half. The smallness of the space on which they fought, and the consequent intermixture of the two armies, may have occasioned in some degree the sanguinary result of the battle. The French position was decidedly the better; the eminence they occupied was higher, and the ascent steeper, and better adapted both for attack and defence.

In this narrow plain between the two armies, are two points about which gathers so much of interest in the battle, that we should have some definite notions of them. In front of the English lines, and on the right, was an old Flemish Chateau, known as Hugomont. It comprised an old tower, and chapel, and a number of offices, partly surrounded by a farmyard. It had also a garden, enclosed by a high, strong, brick

wall, and round the garden a wood of beach, an orchard and and a hedge, by which the wall was concealed. Steps were at once taken to strengthen this place of defence, by loop-holing or perforating the walls for the fire of musketry, and erecting scaffolding, to give the troops within an opportunity of firing from the top of the wall. These judicious measures greatly assisted that successful resistance, which was afterwards made against so many reiterated and desperate attacks.

The other point of interest was the farm of La Haye Sainte. The buildings of this farm are so disposed as to form three sides of a square, the north side comprising the farm house itself, with a portion of the stabling, the west side the remainder of the stables, and the south side principally a large barn; a brick wall, extending along the great road, unites the north and south buildings, and this forms the fourth boundary of the large quadrangular farm-yard. This was defended by six companies, of which Major Baring posted three in the orchard, two in the buildings, and one in the garden.

The first intelligence which Wellington received from Blucher, that Napoleon would advance on Brussels, and that a great battle must be fought at some intermediate point, was on the 15th of June. The Duke was sitting after dinner with a party of officers, over the dessert and wine, when the dispatches came. Wellington did not make much account of the first dispatch, but regarded it as a mere affair of outposts. The second officer arrived from Blucher before twelve o'clock of the same night. The dispatches were delivered to the Duke of Wellington, while in the ball-room of the Duchess of Richmond. As he was reading them, he seemed to be completely absorbed by their contents; and after he had finished, for some minutes he remained in the same attitude of deep reflection, totally abstracted from every surrounding object, while his countenance was expressive of fixed and intense thought. He was heard to say to himself: "Marshal Blucher thinks"—"It is Marshal Blucher's opinion;" and after remaining thus a few moments, and having apparently formed his decision, he gave

his usual clear andconcise orders to one of his staff officers, and was again as gay and animated as ever. Byron's celebrated description of that midnight scene in the Belgian capital, when the drums suddenly beat to arms, and the loud call of the trumpet sounded from every part of the city, is familiar to every one.

Wellington and his troops did not reach the ground selected for battle until Saturday night, the 17th day of June. It rained incessantly during the whole night, while the loud and frequent peals of thunder fell ominously on the ear of the toil-worn soldiers. They had spent the night among the dripping corn-fields, or on the wet earth. Early on Sabbath morning, the 18th day of June, when Bonaparte mounted his horse to survey the position of Wellington, he could see comparatively few troops. He was disappointed. He supposed that the British General, with whom he had come to measure himself, was eager to avoid the strife, and had beaten a retreat. General Foy, who had served some time in Spain, and who knew by experience more of the British General than his master, replied: "Wellington never shows his troops; but if he is yonder, I must warn your majesty, that the English infantry, in close fighting, is the very devil." Bonaparte soon found his mistake, for when the infantry began to work he remarked to some officers near him: "I could never have believed that the English had such fine troops."

There is a striking contrast in the manner in which the French and English troops took their positions. Scarcely a sound was heard from the English eminence. The lines took their places in almost profound silence. This was favored by a piece of woods just in rear of Wellington's position. On the other hand, the thirteen distinct columns of Napoleon advanced to their destined stations with an unusual degree of warlike pomp, and high martial bearing. The movements were executed under the cheering and spirit-stirring sounds of bugles, drums and trumpets, sending forth the long-cherished national military airs of the republic and of the empire. Napoleon, even by French historians, has been blamed for having thus consumed some very precious time in a mere

ostentatious display of his forces. When the French lines had been formed, the Emperor, with his brilliant staff, passed before them. It must have been a most animating scene. The troops hailed him with loud and fervent acclamations. "They carried on their brows a deep-rooted confidence in his ability. They exulted in the idea that they were now fairly ranged in battle-array, under their own chosen chief, against the army of that nation, which of all others had proved the most inveterate, and the most enduring in its hostility to France; a nation which had not only by its wealth cemented and held together the great European league, which had precipitated Bonaparte from the throne, but had also flung into the scale her own native strength and valor, by which the fleets of the empire had been destroyed, its armies driven out of the Peninsula, and the sceptres of Spain and Portugal wrested from her grasp." They appeared as if excited by the assurance that the hour had arrived in which the disasters of the Nile, and Trafalgar, of Salamanca and Vittoria, were to be cast into the shade by the dazzling splendor of the triumph about to be achieved. What a scene it must have been. The great battle of Europe was to be fought. All its kings stood looking on with breathless interest, for their thrones were at stake. As the two great military chieftains thus stood for the first time face to face, and battled for a continent, how their hearts must have been stirred—the one the far-famed conqueror of Italy, the triumphant vanquisher of eastern Europe, the other the victorious liberator of the Peninsula, the bold and successful invader of the south of France.

The strength of the allied army on the field, was sixty-eight thousand men, and one hundred and fifty-six guns; that of the French army seventy-two thousand men, and two hundred and forty-six guns. Thus the French were superior in number and guns, as well as in their position. There is something unaccountable in the delay of Napoleon in beginning the battle. The clock in the church tower at St. Jean had struck eleven before the French made a single hostile

movement. This delay gave the English a fine opportunity for strengthening their position, and in all human probability, turned the tide of success. If Napoleon had thrown his whole force on the English position early on that eventful Sabbath day, the whole issue might have been changed. It reminds us of that quite unaccountable delay of Gen. Lee in renewing the battle of Gettysburg on the second of those three terrible days. God alone knows what would have been the result had Lee pressed on at once, and not given the union forces time and opportunity for throwing up intrenchments on Culp's Hill, Cemetery Hill and Round Top. It would seem that before the forces of Lee, fired with anticipation of overwhelming success, and inspired with the hope of making an almost unobstructed entry in the heart of the north, our troops wonld have fled in utter demoralization. It is not too much to say, from a human point of view, the delay until four o'clock of Thursday afternoon, occasioned the loss to Gen. Lee of the battle of Gettysburg. It may be affirmed likewise of the battle of Waterloo, that the delay of Napoleon in beginning the battle, was one very important element that turned the whole tide. General Brassard, in some very interesting notes, says of General Drouot who acted a prominent part in the battle: "I saw him frequently. We often spoke of the battle of Mount St. Jean. One day he said to me, with the air of one who wished to relieve an oppressed mind, "The more I think of that battle, the more I consider myself as one of the causes of its being lost. You, General? When did the generous devotion of a noble friendship for one's master go further than yours? I shall explain, Colonel. I do not mean to accuse myself of faults I have not committed, but I shall avow what I have done at my own risk and peril. He says: The Emperor was aware of the disposition of the enemy's forces at the break of day; his plan was decided on; he intended to commence the battle at eight or nine in the morning at the latest. I observed to him that the ground was so broken up by the rain, that the movements of the artillery would be very slow, an inconvenience that would be done away with by a delay of two or

three hours. The Emperor consented to make this fatal delay. Had he disregarded my advice, Wellington would have been attacked at seven, beaten at ten, and the victory would have been completed at noon, and Blucher, not arriving until five, would have fallen into the hands of a victorious army." But the chief cause of delay on the part of Napoleon, was the uncertainty as to the positions of Grouchy and Blucher. Where was Blucher with his sixty thousand Prussians, who might come up at an untimely moment to throw themselves fresh in the contest? Where was Grouchy, whose help he so much needed, and whom he had a right to expect early in the morning? This uncertainty must have been a source of the keenest anxiety to the mind of the Emperor.

The battle began at very nearly half past eleven o'clock. Far on the right, Jerome Bonaparte dashes down with twelve thousand men, on the Hugomont. It was one of the most noted charges in the history of war. The charge of General Picket across the beautiful plain at Gettysburg, may have been more imposing, and more brilliant in the eyes of a spectator, for the distance across from the lines of Lee to Round Top, was twice as great as that to be passed over by the French. But for dash and daring, and boldness of execution, there is scarcely anything in history to be compared with the opening charge at Waterloo. It seemed like the mingling of two turbulent streams, or the shock of electricity in the contact of two clouds. As we have said, everything at the Hugomont was in readiness. A sheet of fire ran along the walls of the chateau, and a fearful gap was made in the advancing columns of those gallant Frenchmen. They melted like frostwork before the destructive fire, and as the smoke of the battle slowly arose from that scene of conflict, there was nothing to be seen but the melee of horses and riders, the tossing of banners, and the soaring of the French eagle amid the cloud of war; nought to be heard but the roar of artillery, the braying of trumpets, the blast of the bugle sounding the charge, and the heavy shock of the cavalry. This charge of the French at Hugomont was unsuccessful. For though they worked their way through the trees, a

deadly fire burst from the loop-holes and platforms along the garden wall, and though Prince Jerome sent repeatedly reinforcements in rapid succession, the leading files were laid prostrate.

While this unsuccessful contest was progressing, Marshal Ney was occupied in making preparation to carry into execution Napoleon's grand attack upon the centre. We may regard this as the second decided movement of the French. Their advance was to be covered and supported by ten batteries. It was an imposing force of infantry, cavalry and artillery. The aim of Napoleon was to pierce the enemy's centre. The batteries were posted, and the infantry columns advanced to the inner brow of the intervening ridge. All was ready. Marshal Ney sent word to the Emperor, that he only awaited his orders to begin the attack. Napoleon immediately took a general view of the field of battle, and continued his observations with great anxiety to the right. He perceived there, an indistinct mass having the appearance of a body of troops. He asked Soult's opinion. They were really troops in motion. But who were they? Was it Blucher or Grouchy? In this state of uncertainty and suspense, the Emperor sent for General Dumont to proceed with a strong reconnoitering party, and procure correct intelligence. If Marshal Grouchy, to effect an immediate junction; if Blucher, to impede the advance, that the grand attack of Ney might not be embarrassed. It proved to be the advance guard of the Prussian General Bulow, and the intelligence was received, that the whole Prussian force was not far distant. This compelled Napoleon to employ additional vigilance and circumspection upon his right flank, yet the measures taken were lamentably deficient in energy, vigor and judgment. In the defile of St. Lambert, the whole Prussian force might have been crushed, or at least a co-operation with Wellington greatly delayed. Having left the affair of the Prussians to Dumont, Napoleon gave orders for the grand assault of Marshal Ney. It was a quarter before two o'clock. The first advance of eighteen thousand men was imposing. As the heads of the columns cleared their own line of batter-

ies, ranged along the crest of the intervening ridge, and as the points on which they were directed for attack opened out to their view, loud and reiterated shouts arose from their ranks "Live the Emperor." As they descended the exterior slope of their position, their shouts were drowned in the roar produced by the discharge of seventy-four pieces of French cannon over their heads. The three central columns cross the valley, and boldly advance up the exterior slope of the allied position. The Belgians began a hurried retreat, and as they rushed past the British column, hissings, hootings and execrations were indignantly heaped upon them, and these Belgian Dutch never stopped until they found themselves completely across the main ridge of the allied army. But this flight of the panic-stricken Dutch produced no other effect upon the British army, beyond that of exciting their derision and contempt. As the advancing columns came up to the crest of the allied position, the greater part of the batteries on the French ridge gradually suspended their fire. The partial cessation of their thunder was immediately succeeded by loud and reiterated shouts from the column, "Long live the Emperor." This brilliant charge of Ney was met by the English army, at various points, with a daring and fortitude, which reflected a credit on British valor which has never been surpassed.

It would be quite impossible to follow in detail all the movements of this great battle. After the failure of the attack on Hugomont, which lasted until nearly two o'clock, charge after charge was made on the British position, with all the dash and impetuosity of Frenchmen, until the British commander, wiping the sweat from his brow, exclaimed: "Oh! that Blucher or night would come." The exclamation had no sooner escaped the lips of Wellington, than down came thundering twenty thousand French cavalry on one of the English squares. A correspondent says: "The French came down at a plunging trot, then breaking into a gallop, fell like a rock hurled from the mountain; they recoiled from the shock. Driven to desperation by their repeatedly foiled attempts, they stopped their horses, and coolly walked

them around that brave square, and whenever a man fell, dashed in. Such desperate resolution, such recklessness of life, began to tell at length on the conflict. The square began to shake and quiver, when Wellington came dashing up with his guard. They opened, and he was in its bosom. The chief was in their keeping—his fate voluntarily thrown into their hands; those British hearts could not yield. Rank after rank fell, but not a man stirred from his footsteps. Again, and again, on separate squares were these terrific charges made, and again, as they wavered, did Wellington fling himself in their midst. Thus the battle raged from half past eleven in the forenoon, until four o'clock in the afternoon, the English acting entirely on the defensive, and valiantly meeting terrible blows which the French inflicted with such might and frequency. At that hour a new element enters the conflict. Away off to the right, with banners flying in the breeze, eager to throw all their energy in the combat, and wipe away the disgrace incurred at the defeat at Ligny, was Blucher with his sixty-thousand Prussians. Napoleon detected them as soon as they emerged from the wood, and saw in an instant, if a junction should be made with Wellington, the day would be irretrievably lost. Before this could be consummated, he rode up to his old guard, who thus far had taken no part in the battle. He told them the fate of the battle and of France was now in their hands. There was a magic spell in his presence, and as he pointed significantly to the allied position, the gesture drew forth renewed shouts: "Long live Napoleon." The old guard proudly took the lead in this grand attack—a sacred cohort, whose glory had ever shone conspicuously, when a great crisis summoned forth those energies, by which its valor and its prowess had acquired for it imperishable renown.

The guard, under Ney, came down in beautiful array, and with hearts burning with high hopes. A correspondent says: "They knew that their Emperor and the civilized world were looking on. They carried thrones and kings as they went. They needed nothing to fire their steady courage. No drum, or trumpet, or martial strain cheered them on. No bugle

sounded the charge. In perfect order and silence, they moved over the plain. Above them soared the French eagle, no power had ever yet wrested from their grasp, and on them was the eye of Bonaparte. The allied army saw with dread the approach of that unconquerable legion. The calm was but momentary, for soon an artillery fire opened, before which whole ranks went down. The charge seemed resistless. The first lines of the English melted away, and on the old guard pressed, until they came within a few rods of the spot where Wellington stood. The day seemed lost to the English. It looked as if impossible to throw in any thing to stop the progress of that victorious legion, for it swept like a torrent." This was the critical point of the Battle of Waterloo. The French were within fifty yards of the place where the British commander stood, when Wellington made that talismanic call: "Up, guards; make ready." It seemed to the French that these men had sprung from the earth, so sudden was their appearance. They opened on the advancing columns such a tremendous volley, thrown in with such coolness, deliberation and precision, that the entire mass staggered under the effect. They recoiled from the discharge as though smitten in the face by an angel of death. A second column of the imperial guard came up, but breaking into the wildest confusion, shared the fate of the first. Successive, but unavailing attacks were made, until near the close of the day.

The English troops had complained of their passive endurance of the attacks, and murmured, that they could not be led forth from the intrenchments; but now their murmurs gave place to intense exultation, and shouts of triumph, for there on the highest point of view, stood prominently the Duke of Wellington, his hat raised high in air, a signal for the commencement of a general advance. At this moment, the faint rays of the setting sun shone forth, and as they struggled to penetrate the almost universal haze created by the unremitting volumes of smoke, which a close, dense atmosphere appeared incapable of dissipating, they cast upon the varied objects on the field a lurid light, imparting to them a coloring so impressive, as could never be effaced from the

memories of those who witnessed the scene. The English army seemed inspired with a new life. The unfurled banners raised aloft, proudly displaying their shattered remnants; drums, bugles, trumpets, sending forth their warlike sounds to commingle with the enthusiastic and tumultuous cheering of the troops; squadrons pressing forward to gain the ridge, as this became vacated by the first line, to behold and participate in the glorious triumph; soldiers hurrying on to join their ranks, and share in the inspiring excitement of the moment; in the distance, in front, the retiring masses of the French; far away on the heights, the dark columns of the Prussians, all together, it must have been a wonderful scene after the hard struggle of the day.

It has been asserted by French historians, that Wellington would not have gained the battle, but for the timely co-operation of Blucher. This is an error. The guard of Napoleon failed in their onset, and the grand attack of the day had utterly failed before Blucher had fired a gun. The retreat had begun before the memorable meeting of Wellington and Blucher at La Belle Alliance. This was half past nine in the evening. The interview was in a miserable cottage, pierced through and through with cannon balls, and deserted by all but the dead and dying. They agreed that the British troops, who had fought for nearly twelve hours, should relinquish the pursuit to the Prussians, who had come in at the close of the contest, in time to decide the victory, and to share its glory. They parted. As Wellington crossed again the fatal scene, on which the silence of death had now succeeded to the storm of battle, the moon, breaking from dark clouds, shed an uncertain light upon the wide field of carnage, covered with mangled thousands of that gallant army, whose heroic valor had won for him the brightest wreath of victory, and left to future times an imperishable monument of their country's fame. He saw himself surrounded by the bloody corpses of his veteran soldiers, who had followed him through distant lands—his associates in arms—his companions through many an eventful year of danger and glory; in that awful pause, which follows the mortal conflict of man with man,

emotions unknown, or stifled in the heat of battle, forced their way; the feelings of the man triumphed over those of the general, and in the very hour of victory, Wellington wept. His heart sickened at the awful scene before him. On those slopes, and in that quiet valley, no less than fifty thousand were dead or dying—fifty thousand in nine hours.

The forty thousand Prussians, comparatively fresh, began at once the fierce and eager pursuit of Napoleon. The Prussians had a peculiar dislike for the French, and hence engaged in this work with an alacrity seldom equalled. The atrocities of that night of the 18th of June, can never be told. The army of Napoleon, so recently strong and well disciplined, had become a mob, a disorganized mass of human beings. They fled in indiscriminate confusion over those hills, on which they had so proudly filed on the morning of that eventful day. It is a remarkable fact, that intelligence of the overwhelming defeat was not received in Paris until Napoleon himself communicated it. His costly traveling carriage, provided with every convenience, was captured. It contained drawers, filled with various articles of value; some belonging to Bonaparte's toilet; others for the table, mostly of solid gold. Besides this carriage, it seems that seven other state carriages were taken, among which was a magnificent state coach, in which he intended to make his entry into Brussels, drawn by eight cream-colored stallions; all his baggage, diamonds and treasures were taken. His traveling library consisted of eight hundred volumes. Another correspondent says: "The captured carriages contained a gold and silver set, including above seventy pieces; a large silver chronometer; a steel bedstead with Merino mattrasses; a pair of pistols; a green velvet cap. There was also a diamond head dress, hat, sword, uniform, and an imperial mantle. Several boxes of mounted and unmounted diamonds, large silver services, with the arms of Napoleon, and pieces, with his name and portrait, were taken by the soldiers of the battallion making the capture."

Thus ended a day, disastrous to the French arms, but

which raised England to the highest pitch of military renown, and brightened the glory which she had gained at Cressy and Agincourt, on the burning sands of Egypt and the sheltered shores of Italy, on the mountains of Portugal, the plains of Spain, amidst the rocks of the Pyrenees, the fields of Flanders and the valleys of France. It is not for us to follow the waning fortune of Napoleon—his retreat and his capture; save that when he reached Paris, he found the tide of enthusiasm had considerably ebbed, so much so that Lafayette felt at liberty to make that renowned utterance, in reply to Prince Lucien, which utterance may be regarded as an expression of a rapidly growing sentiment. In the Assembly, Lafayette, in a tone as cold and trenchant as steel, remarked: "Prince, you calumniate the nation. Posterity will not blame France for abandoning Napoleon, but alas! for having obeyed him too long. Frenchmen have followed him to the plains of Italy, through the burning sands of Egypt, through the heats of Spain, across the plains of Germany and the frozen desert of Russia. Six hundred thousand Frenchmen lie on the banks of the Ebro and the Tagus. Can you tell how many fell on the banks of the Danube, the Elbe, the Niemen, and the Moskowa? Alas! had the country been less faithful to him, two millions of her children might have been saved. Your brother, your family—we all should have been saved from the precipice down which we have fallen, and from which we know not whether there is any escape."

We have had a special object in presenting these details of one of the great decisive struggles of the world. Though the French were overwhelmed with defeat, they excite our admiration as a brave, noble, high-spirited people. We scarcely recognize them as the French of 1871. Every movement of the recent strife, was marked by a rashness, weakness, and even imbecility, which excites our surprise. The political impotence of the nation is amazing. It can be shown clearly, that from the first revolution of 1789, France has been losing capacity for self-government, until the most ardent friends of Republicanism have become discouraged.

There were loose, wild and lawless elements, beyond all question, in the assemblies of '48 and '49, but the elements of strength and success were vastly greater than in any deliberative gathering of the late reaction. It is folly to attribute the late failure to any special weakness on the part of Napoleon III, and affirm that the Emperor failed to excite the imagination of the French people, and thus they fell before the first approach of German arms. It was not the failure of the Emperor, but the failure of the nation. True, he has no capacity for leading armies. His administrative talent is radically defective. There is no magnetism in his character to kindle the ardor of Frenchmen. His personal bearing at Magenta and Solferino indicates the absence of every trait of the great general. His intellect is radically languid, constantly under the sedative influence of a love of pleasure, and entirely without the "restless and impulsive vigilance of all great administrative natures." There are deeper causes for this great failure, which has excited the wonder and pity of the world. Napoleon III is only the creature of the French people. He is a just expression of what the whole nation has become by a peculiar educating process. The temper and history of the people made him what he is, and his whole policy, one of "patches and expedients," fell under the terrible stress of an untimely war. It is one of the deepest and most interesting problems of modern times, in connection with political and social interests, to detect the real causes which lie beneath this marvelous exhibition of national weakness.

ARTICLE II.

STRANGE FIRE WORSHIPERS.

By Rev. R. A. Fink, A. M., Johnstown, Pa.

The very mention of "strange fire" suggests the names of Nadab and Abihu. And as these may be taken as the representatives of a class of persons concerning whom we design

to write, it will be necessary, first of all, to speak of them and their sin in particular. Of their birth we know nothing, save that it was in Egypt, and probably not less than forty years before the exode. The first time they are mentioned is in the enumeration of the descendants of Levi, Exod. 6 : 23. They were sons of Aaron and Elisheba, supposed to be the same with Elizabeth. As none of the Hebrews appear to have been exempted from the cruel bondage of Egypt, these two probably shared in that oppression which moved the compassion of Heaven. They had heard the voice of the task-master enforcing the rigorous directions of Pharaoh; they had toiled hard through the day, that they might have the tale of brick to deliver in the evening. Their first years were thus spent in hard labor and sorrow. They had witnessed all the signs and wonders of Egypt; had seen the river rolling in loathsome blood, to the Egyptians, while to themselves it was pure and wholesome water; had seen the whole land filled with noisome insects and vile reptiles, and then desolated with devouring locusts and destructive hail, while their own land was safe. They had seen darkness on every side mounting, like walls, up to heaven, while Goshen enjoyed the light of day. With their father's house they joined in "keeping the passover and the sprinkling of blood;" and heard, no doubt, the great and bitter cry of the Egyptians on the death of their first born. They accompanied their brethren in leaving the "house of bondage," and commencing their journey to "the land of promise." "By faith they passed through the Red Sea, as by dry land." These were astonishing displays of divine power, calculated to be the more striking and make the more useful and lasting impressions, because of the distinction made, in every instance, between the Egyptians and themselves.

Nor can we doubt that they had been piously educated; had been carefully instructed in the knowledge and worship of the true God. The parents of Moses and Aaron are mentioned, by an inspired apostle, as distinguished for their faith. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for," because it is "the evidence of things not seen" by the eye of enlighten-

ed reason. These parents had before them some object of hope which would lead forward their thoughts and give them a pleasing and interesting employment. This object of hope was made known to them through some promise, some revelation from God, in the knowledge and belief of which faith consists. Promises of the most interesting nature had been made to Abraham, which were not yet accomplished; covenant engagements had been entered into with him, which were not yet fulfilled. This information would be handed down from father to son, and become the principle of faith in the pious descendants of the patriarch. The prophetic blessings of Isaac, and especially the last words, the dying blessing of Jacob, delivered after his descent into Egypt, would not be forgotten. "Joseph," also, "when he died," at a more recent period, "by faith made mention of the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his bones." These bones were carefully and piously preserved, and carried to Canaan; they would be the memorial of the prophetic communication made by Joseph, when bidding adieu to his brethren and to the world. Through these patriarchs, then, we clearly and distinctly trace a revelation from God of such an important nature as would become the principle of faith and piety. But few, indeed, of the Hebrews, at this time, seem to have been pious; of that few, however, were these parents. In the same manner, through their patriarchs, they were taught the worship of God. Their object in leaving Egypt was, that they might serve the Lord, might do sacrafice to their God, and to the God of their fathers. That Aaron himself, therefore, was piously educated, there can be no doubt; and that he was, though not blameless, yet a pious man, is equally evident. He would not fail, therefore, to instruct his sons in the knowledge of that revelation which came from God. He would make them acquainted with that covenant with Abraham, according to which this branch of his posterity was adopted as the peculiar people of God. He would labor to inspire them with the hope of that departure, mentioned by Joseph, of reaching that land promised to Abraham, and

there engaging in religious worship, which for ages was to be the privilege and happiness of their nation. With the view of exciting their pious sentiments, the judgments of Egypt would be pointed out as indications of their approaching departure, and as terrible exhibitions of the divine displeasure against sin, and, therefore, as strong inducements to reverence and obey that Almighty Being whose power they beheld. With the same pious intention he might lead them to the coffin containing the body of Joseph, and with this sacred deposit before their eyes, endeavor to strengthen their faith by explaining to them the promise and covenant of God, the history of their ancestors, and the oath that had been taken that these bones should finally rest in Canaan. Such were the sorrows and oppressions these sons of Aaron had experienced; such were the terrible and striking exhibition of divine power they had witnessed; and such, in all probability, was the education they had received.

The Hebrews, now liberated from bondage, are to take their rank among the nations of the earth, and to become an organized community of both a civil and religious character. It was their peculiarity and their privilege, to have God himself for their law-giver and their king. Immediately from Him they received that code of laws by which they were to be governed; and which, if the circumstances and character of this people are considered, has never been equalled by the wisdom of man. Just emancipated from slavery, they were generally a rude, uncultivated mass; of course, nothing but a system of laws very plain, easy to be understood, and in great detail, would suit them. Such were the precepts by which they were to be governed as members of the civil community. With these were incorporated those precepts which prescribed their mode of worship, and were to govern them as members of a religious community. These were more singular, though if the purposed to be answered by them be duly considered, not less wise than the former. The Jews were to be a peculiar people; and their ecclesiastical polity was wisely adapted to perpetuate this peculiarity. The tendency of their annual festivals, their daily and occasional sacrifices, their nu-

merous rites and ceremonies, prescribed for a great variety of circumstances and conditions in life, was such as to preserve them from imitating the manners, and especially the idolatry of other nations. Nor less calculated were these rites to prevent other nations from uniting with them, unless from pious motives, and with the view of worshiping Jehovah. For the purpose of witnessing the terrible majesty, and hearing the voice of their Lawgiver, they are led to Mount Sinai, where God himself descends and communes with Moses for forty days. There was delivered the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, those great principles of moral duty, which are permanent in their character, and binding on every age and nation of men. There was shown to Moses the pattern of a building which he was to construct, called the Tabernacle, to be consecrated to the worship of God. Nothing respecting this singular edifice, is left to the wisdom and invention of man. The materials for every part, its dimensions, its sockets and its pins, its boards and its bars, its curtains and its coverings, were all minutely prescribed by Him for whose honor it was to be built. Around it was a court about one hundred and eighty feet by ninety in extent, inclosed by pillars and curtains about nine feet in height. Within this enclosure stood the Tabernacle itself, constructed of forty-eight boards, overlaid on the inside and on the out with pure gold. These boards stood upright, and at the bottom were placed in ninety-six sockets of silver, fastened to the ground with pins of brass. Each socket was worth, in our currency, more than one thousand dollars; and the whole of them together, more than one hundred thousand. The building itself was about fifty-four feet in length, eighteen in breadth, and eighteen in height. To the eye it would have the appearance of a tolerably large house. Over the whole were two coverings of costly materials and splendid workmanship; and over the top, forming the roof, to secure it from the rain, were two other coverings of skins. This building, including all its materials and its workmanship, is supposed to have been worth not less than one million of dollars. It was certainly the most extraordinary building ever constructed by

the hands of men. The Temple excelled it in wealth, in magnitude, and in splendor; but the materials for this grand edifice had been collecting for near half a century. It was built by the most powerful monarch of the east, and by the wisest of the human race, aided by a people who had been improving in the arts of organized society for centuries. Besides, the temple was permanent, to remain on the same spot till destroyed by the ravages of time, or demolished by the hands of violence. The Tabernacle was built in the wilderness, by a people emerging but yesterday from a state of slavery, untaught, it would seem, in every art but those of making brick, and watching their flocks. This was a moveable structure. Firm and compact as it was when standing, it was taken to pieces, and with all its furniture and the enclosure of its court, was carried from place to place, and erected again as occasion required. In the mount Moses also received instruction respecting those who were to conduct the public worship. The whole tribe of Levi were to be set apart to the service of the Tabernacle. But more especially respecting the priesthood are directions given with great minuteness; nothing is left to his own choice or discretion. The men first to be invested with this high and sacred office are mentioned by name: Aaron and his sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazer and Ithamur, are elected for this purpose. Moses is to furnish to his brethren an example of implicit obedience to the will of their Sovereign.

The workmanship of the Tabernacle and its furniture is now completed; and all that is wanting to commence the worship of God in the manner prescribed, is the consecration of the priests to their office. Moses, therefore, proceeds to the performance of this important service. As it is in behalf of the people, as well as themselves, the priests are to minister, the whole congregation are assembled at the door of the Tabernacle, that they may witness the manner in which their priests are set apart to their solemn functions. In presence of the whole multitude thus convened, "Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water," which appears to have been the first ceremony in the consecration.

Aaron is then clothed with the vestments peculiar to the office of high-priest, and the anointing oil, of a peculiar composition, is poured on his head. With the same oil, and at the same time, the Tabernacle with all its furniture is anointed, and thus *sanctified* for use. Then the sons of Aaron are clothed with the garments peculiar to the office of the ordinary priesthood. These do not appear to have been anointed with oil, as Aaron was. Then a bullock is brought, on the head of which Aaron and his sons lay their hands "for the sin offering." With the blood of this victim the altar is "sanctified to make reconciliation upon it." Part of this bullock is burnt on the altar, and part without the camp. Then Moses brings the "ram for a burnt offering," on the head of which also they lay their hands. The blood of this ram is sprinkled on the altar, and it is burnt, "an offering made by fire unto the Lord." Another ram, called "the ram of consecration," is slain, the blood of which is applied to the right ear, to the thumb on the right hand, and to the great toe on the right foot of Aaron and his sons. Part of the flesh of this ram is eaten by Aaron and his sons, and another, it is said, "was Moses part." Then Moses "took of the anointing oil, and the blood which was upon the altar," and sprinkled it on the garments of Aaron and his sons, "and sanctified Aaron and his garments, and his sons and his sons' garments." For seven days they were to abide at the door of the Tabernacle, and on each day the same sacrifices were to be offered as on the first; these things they were to observe at the peril of their lives.

Such were the solemn rites by which the first of the Jewish priesthood were consecrated to the functions of their holy office. Aaron as high priest, was distinguished from his sons by some vestments peculiar to his office, and by the anointing oil poured on his head; in other respects the rites of consecration were alike. The whole scene was calculated to make deep, lasting and useful impressions on their own minds, and on the minds of the people. The washing with water pointed out the necessity of purity of heart in those who served

at the altar. The sacred vestments in which they were clothed, "for glory and for beauty," would distinguish them as the ministers of God, show them the excellency of the service in which they were engaged, and remind them of those robes of salvation in which they ought to be adorned. The oil with which the high-priest was anointed and their garments were sprinkled, would teach them unreserved devotedness to their work, and also the necessity of the "unction from the Holy One;" the influences of the Spirit to assist them in their work. Laying their hands on the head of those animals offered in sacrifice, implied their confession of sin, on account of which they deserved that death which these victims suffered; while the blood which was shed, and the death which they witnessed would typify that promised Messiah who was one day to bleed and suffer death to make reconciliation for his people. That their minds might be the more deeply impressed with the importance of their work, and that they might not rashly, without deliberate and serious reflection, enter on it, seven days are spent, during which they could neither enter the Tabernacle nor depart from its door.

Such was the manner in which Nadab and Abihu were separated to the most important office ever filled by man. In these ceremonies were implied purity of heart, entire devotedness to God, confession and sorrow for sin, with a joyous hope of pardon through the death of the Saviour, of whom they themselves, and the sacrifices which they offered, were instructive types. Heretofore the worship of God had been conducted, and, as occasion required, the sacrifices offered, by the patriarchs of each family, and by other individuals distinguished for their piety and zeal; but henceforth these duties could be performed only by the priests, regularly inducted into office. Others, though distinguished for their piety, though elvated to the dignities of royalty, could not, with this intention, approach the altar, but at the peril of life. Aaron and his sons, till the end of the Jewish economy, were exclusively appointed to this service. "*Holiness to the Lord*," borne on the forehead of the high-priest, was the motto and

the designation of the whole order. They were to be the intercessors, the mediators between God and the whole nation. Everything in the manner of this consecration, in the daily service claiming their attention, was powerfully calculated to impress the mind with the most sublime sentiments of devotion towards God, and to expand the heart with the purest benevolence towards their brethren.

The purification of the Tabernacle and all its furniture is now completed; "the glory of the Lord," the visible token of the divine presence, is ready to descend upon it. The altar is ready to receive and to sanctify the gifts and the offerings laid upon it. The most holy place is ready to receive the high-priest, with his burning incense, into the immediate presence of God. The consecration of the priests is also completed, and they are ready to enter on their holy and solemn functions. At length the light of the eighth day dawns on the camp of Israel, and Moses calls upon Aaron and his sons to commence their sacerdotal ministrations. The animals for sacrifice, and all other offerings, agreeable to particular directions, are prepared and brought together. The multitude are assembled,—"all the congregation drew near, and stood before the Lord"—all things are now ready for the service to commence; the appointed hour has come. Aaron, clothed in his pontifical garments, attended by his sons, approaches the altar, and now the first victim bleeds by the hand of the regular priesthood. This is a sin-offering for Aaron himself, and for the whole order, of which he is the representative and the chief. The next is a sin-offering for the people. Thus Aaron was to "make an atonement for himself and for the people." They are sinners themselves, they minister for a sinful nation; in the very first services, therefore, in which they engage, in the first blood they shed, they acknowledge their guilt, on account of which they confess themselves to be worthy of death. The sacrifices are laid in order on the altar, ready for the fire to be kindled, and the whole service in its progress becomes more deeply interesting. "And Aaron lifted up his hand towards the people and blessed them." When this blessing was pro-

nounced, Aaron and his sons were standing at the altar, not yet having entered the Tabernacle itself. Now "Moses and Aaron went into the Tabernacle," and after performing the appointed service there, "came out and blessed the people" again; "and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people." At the same moment, "there came a fire out from the presence of the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat; which, when the people saw, they shouted and fell on their faces."

This is certainly a day to be had in devout and perpetual remembrance, distinguished, on several accounts, from all others in the annals of Israel. Here is the first edifice ever built exclusively for the worship of Jehovah, entered for the first time by the high-priest. Here is an order of men officiating for the first time in the duties of that office to which they have been solemnly consecrated; shedding blood, inflicting death, and offering their sacrifices to God for the first time. Here is a whole nation, probably not less than two millions, organized into a visible church, assembled around their sanctuary, uniting for the first time in public and solemn acts of religious worship, and therein confessing their sins and professing themselves to be the people of God, receiving the first benediction of heaven from the lips of their high-priest, constituted mediator between them and their God. Here is God himself acknowledging the relation, and proclaiming himself to be their God by descending among them in visible glory; the first time this symbol of the divine majesty was ever seen by the eyes of men. His approbation and acceptance of their offerings, is declared by fire coming out from His presence and consuming the sacrifices laid on the altar. Mingled sentiments of joy and sacred awe, pervade the whole assembly; the one expressed by their loud acclamations, the other by falling prostrate on their faces. When we see the priests in their holy vestments, the fire blazing on the altar, the Tabernacle covered and filled with the Shekinah, and two millions of worshipers prostrate on the ground, we cannot avoid some degree of the same feelings.

Hitherto, Nadab and Abihu have appeared chiefly in connection with their father and their brethren; but now they stand out to view in most prominent relief. "And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, *and offered strange fire before the Lord*, which he commanded them not. *And there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.*" Such was the rash and presumptuous offence, and such the tragical death of these two young men.

Their crime seems to have been of a complicated nature. The duties of the priests were prescribed with so much exactness, and also the day and the hour when they were to be performed, that the slightest departure from these prescriptions, was considered and treated as rebellion against God. The burning of incense in the holy place was, indeed, the duty of the priest; but these were not the circumstances, nor was this the hour for the discharge of this duty; their doing it, therefore, at this time, manifested their disregard of the authority of God. Even at the proper time, this was the duty of but one of the priests; both of them attempting it, at the same time, is a further proof of their criminal disregard. Besides, we find Moses, though not of the priesthood, superintending the operations of this day. Thus in the morning he called Aaron and his sons, and directed the order, the time, and the place for each duty; thus also he went with Aaron into the Tabernacle when the time for the service arrived. They ought, therefore, to have waited till they were directed by Moses. But, impatient to enter on what they, no doubt, considered their most honorable function, they presumptuously approached the door of the Tabernacle with the view of entering it; and thus furnished additional evidence of irreverence. They lighted their censers with fire, not from the altar of burnt-offering, from which alone it ought to be taken, but from some other place, which the Lord commanded not, and of course did not permit. In this they gave further proof of an impious and rebellious spirit; for this is called "*strange fire.*" Some think that in addition to

all this, they were heated with wine. The reason assigned for this opinion is, the prohibition delivered to Aaron, immediately after the death of these two young men: "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the Tabernacle of the congregation; lest ye die; it shall be a statute forever, throughout your generations." If this was the case, if they were heated with wine, instead of furnishing an excuse, it was rather an aggravation of their other guilt, while this itself was a crime for which there could be no excuse.

When we consider the education they had received, the wonders they beheld in Egypt, and at the Red Sea, the terrible exhibitions of Sinai, the solemn and impressive rites through which they had just passed, the professions they had made in these rites, the nature of that service to which they were consecrated, and that even at this very moment the visible glory of Jehovah was shining in their faces, the guilt of their rebellion will appear to be peculiarly aggravated. They did not sanctify the Lord in coming nigh unto Him, nor glorify Him before all the people, with that spirit of reverence and implicit obedience which their holy office required. Had they escaped with impunity, the precedent might have had a most unhappy effect on themselves, and on the whole order, emboldening them also to disregard the authority of God, in hopes of the same impunity. The Lord was therefore pleased to cut them off by a terrible stroke, in the very midst of their rebellion, and thus set them forth as an example and a warning to their successors in all subsequent ages.

The trial of Aaron was great indeed. These were his sons, whom he had endeavored to train up in the ways of piety, of whose usefulness he had doubtless entertained the fondest hopes. These hopes are just beginning to be realized; these sons have just been consecrated priests of their whole nation, and have entered on their holy ministrations. One of them, Nadab, is to be his successor, is to be clothed with the vestments now worn by himself, is to enter the most holy place, and appear in the immediate presence of God. But while his heart is expanding with this pure delight, he sees these

sons smitten with a terrible death from the hand of God. Yet he is not permitted the mournful pleasure of shedding a tear, or giving any external signs of sorrow. Others carry them out to their burial; neither he nor his other two sons are permitted to leave the door of the Tabernacle "lest they die; for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon them." The father and the man must be merged in the high-priest of God. Severe as the trial was, however, "Aaron held his peace, and did according to the word of Moses."

From a comparison between the Levitical priest and the Christian minister, it will appear that, in some things, they resemble each other; while, in others, they widely differ. They are both set apart to the functions of their office by certain rites and ceremonies. We have seen the numerous rites employed in consecrating the priest; until these are performed, he was not permitted to engage in the ministrations of the sanctuary. The Christian minister is also set apart, or as it is more generally termed, ordained to his office by solemn and impressive rites. This is done "by the laying on of hands" and "by prayer." We learn this from the example of Timothy's ordination, and also from the directions given to him; "Lay hands suddenly on no man." Under the gospel, in all ordinary cases, no man is authorized to perform the duties peculiar to the ministry until he is thus set apart by prayer and the laying on of the hands of two or more of those who are already invested with ministerial authority.

Again; they resemble each other in this; that both are exclusively devoted to the duties of their office. The Jewish priest held no possession among his brethren; and was prohibited, in the most peremptory manner, from engaging in any secular pursuit. At the altar alone he was to serve, and on the altar alone he was to depend for his maintenance, and that of his family. No fear of want, no pretence of providing for his family, would be sustained as an excuse for departing from these positive injunctions. In like manner the Christian minister is devoted exclusively to the great interests of religion, to the promotion of the Redeemer's kingdom. He is "separated unto the gospel;" he is to give himself wholly to

these things. His mind is not to be embarrassed, his attention divided by worldly cares and pursuits. Exercising proper economy and self-denial, he is to depend on his ministry, on the provisions of the church, on the providence of God for his maintenance, and that of his family.

Once more; they are alike in this, that both are to be governed, in their ministrations, by the will of God. The duties, the time and manner of their performance, were prescribed in detail to the priest. If he neglected that which was enjoined; if he did that which was *not commanded*, it was rebellion, and subjected him to reprehension and punishment. He was to give "thus saith the Lord," as his authority for all that he did. This, as we have seen, was the crime of Nadab and Abihu, that they did not observe the authority of God in the discharge of their duty. The Christian minister, being the servant of God, is not less bound to obey the will of his Master. In his efforts to enlighten and reform the world, he is to "preach the word," as the means of producing this important change. If he reasons as he ought to do, it will be "out of the Scriptures." In giving each one his portion, it is "the word of truth he is rightly to divide." What Timothy had received as the gospel, "the same he was to commit to faithful men, who might be able to teach others also." If the preacher should undertake to supply supposed deficiencies in the gospel with his own fancies, with his own errors, it would be "*strange fire*;" he would expose himself to the anathema of the Head of the Church, whose "pure word of life" he corrupts.

On the other hand, there are some things in which they widely differ. The priesthood under the law, was confined to one single family; Aaron and his sons. No other man, however distinguished for his piety, his talents, or his learning, could serve at the altar. When the Church was first organized, and after the death of Nadab and Abihu, there were but three for the whole nation; yet no others were clothed with sacerdotal authority, to supply this deficiency. All the males, however, of this family, except those disqualified by certain blemishes, were devoted to the sacred office; and, in process

of time, the priests, with the assistance of the Scribes, were amply sufficient for all the services required of them. No such restrictions regulate the gospel ministry. Jesus Christ, in selecting the first preachers of the kingdom, did not search the register of Aaron's family to ascertain their genealogy. Nor did the apostles, in "ordaining elders in every city," observe the old rule. They laid their hands on men of sound mind who "desired the good work," who were "apt to teach," whose ministry would "edify the body of Christ," and "perfect the saints." The door to the gospel ministry is open to every man, having "a good report of them that are without," and possessing the requisite qualifications, both natural and spiritual; none such ought to be excluded from "this work and labor of love." Every pious mother, when clasping her infant son to her bosom, may cherish the hope that, if the Lord shall qualify him by his grace, this son may be "an ambassador for Christ," to proclaim salvation to a guilty and perishing world; and like Hannah of old, and many a godly mother, may devote her son to the service of God in the ministry. Nothing forbids her indulging this hope, and training him up for this purpose. Every prayer she breathes, and every lesson she teaches, may be inspired and characterized by this desire.

Again: the Levitical priest could not perform the service of the sanctuary unless he was clad in the garments prescribed for his order. The material of which these vestments were composed, their color, the fashion in which they were made, were all pointed out with great exactness. In him it would have been criminal to minister in the ordinary dress of the Jews. No such precepts require the observance of the Christian minister. Jesus Christ "the Apostle and High Priest of our profession," wore, there is reason to believe, the same kind of clothing which was common among that rank of society in which he chose to appear. In reading the history of the apostles, there is nothing said, except incidentally, as Paul mentions his *cloak*, which will suggest a single idea respecting their dress. The preacher of the gospel is not

required to minister in either a white or a black color, made in the fashion of a surplice, a gown, or a coat. These matters may give rise to dissension, and even persecution amongst men; but the "Lord has not commanded them." If anything can be considered as a rule on this subject, it is probably this: that his dress should be such in its materials, its colors, and its fashion, as would be least calculated to divide the attention or attract the notice of those to whom he ministers. He should manifest his zeal and prove his relation to Jesus Christ and the Church, not by his dress, but by his spirit and by his example. The place, therefore, of a desire to gain distinction and notice by singularity of dress, ought to be supplied with some other desire, more in accordance with the "ministry of reconciliation." The man should disappear in the zeal and humility of the minister. Let no "*strange fire*" come near to the altar of Jehovah.

The difference between the priest and the minister, appears in nothing more than it does in the number and complicated nature of the ceremonies requiring the close attention of the one, compared with the few, simple, and spiritual rites, in which the other is to be engaged. We have seen the number of sacrifices and offerings, the holy garments, and the number of days employed in consecrating the priest to his office. The minister of the gospel, after giving the requisite proof of his qualifications, is ordained to the service of the Church in a few minutes, by the imposition of hands, and by prayer. The first was as vigorously bound to the strict observance of years, and months, and weeks, and days, and hours, in the performance of his duty, as he was to that duty itself. The minister learns from the example of the apostles and first Christians that one day in each week requires his observance; that is "the Lord's day," or as it is frequently called the Christian Sabbath. This day he religiously and cheerfully sanctifies to God and to His service. He does not find in the New Testament, either from precept or example, the least shadow of authority for the observance of any other day but this alone. The Head of the Church may say of the stated observance of any other day, though distinguished by his

birth or his crucifixion, as was said of the offering of Nadab and Abihu, it is a service which "he commanded them not." And even on the Lord's day no particular hour is mentioned for public worship; such hours as are most convenient to minister and his people may be selected for this purpose. The priest was engaged in numerous external rites, many of them very complicated, and therefore difficult in their observance. By these different rites the different dispositions, intentions and desires of the heart were expressed. On some occasions the very words he was to use were distinctly prescribed, and even the direction in which he should turn his face, was not left to his own choice. Part of the sacrifices was to be disposed of in one way, and part in another. Some of the offerings presented were compounded of different ingredients, all added according to an exact proportion, which must be scrupulously observed. The Christian minister is free from these burdensome rites. In the service of the Church, he has to consecrate by prayer the simple elements of bread and wine, and then distribute these emblems of the Saviour's body and blood to the communicants. Christian baptism is administered by the application of water, in the name of the Holy Trinity. Singing, prayer, reading and expounding the Scriptures are the public duties in which he engages. The rite of confirmation he administers in the simplest manner, by the imposition of hands and by prayer. Nor is there in the New Testament any authority for a prescribed form of words for any occasion, nor even for any certain order in which these different parts of public service are to succeed each other. We find the apostles and their companions sometimes engaged in prayer, sometimes in singing and prayer without preaching, and sometimes in preaching without either singing or prayer. Though custom has given a certain order to these parts of service, yet they might not be the less instructive and edifying without the strict observance of this order.

Nothing in the preceding reflections impeaches the wisdom or the goodness of the Levitical economy, under which the priest officiated; it was admirably adapted to the state and character of the people for whose benefit it was chiefly in-

tended; and to answer great and important purposes in the world. The unquenchable fire on their altar, and their other peculiarities, were wisely calculated to teach others having intercourse with them, the knowledge and worship of Jehovah, the true God, and thus to bear a perpetual and decisive testimony against the polytheism and idolatry of the surrounding nations. It was calculated and intended to prepare the Jews and the world for the coming of Christ and His kingdom, by exciting ardent desires and hopes for this great event. These *shadows* pointed forward to the *substance* which was to come. The sacrifices and offerings of the altar were typical, of course, prophetic, and, therefore, clearly taught the coming of the antitype, the great Messiah, in whose vicarious sufferings and death for the sins of his people these types would all be fulfilled and abolished; and thus a dispensation more simple and more spiritual would be introduced. The rites under the Christian system are not, strictly speaking, typical, but commemorative and significant. The bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper, are hallowed memorials of the sufferings and death of the Saviour. The baptismal water is the outward sign of inward and spiritual grace. The few simple and spiritual rites of the present economy, compared with the "burden," the "yoke of bondage" of the former, is liberty; "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

Aaron and his sons, and indeed all his male posterity, except those marked with blemishes, were "called of God" to the office of the priesthood. The first who were invested with this office, were mentioned to Moses individually by name; they were, therefore, subjected to no examination respecting their qualifications. And yet, though called of God, it is certain that Nadab and Abihu were not men of piety; the manner of their death decides this question. It is equally certain that many of the priests, in subsequent times, were wicked and profligate men. The sons of Eli "made themselves vile," not only in the sight of God, but also of men. Every man who was a descendant of Aaron, and without blemish, was called to the sacerdotal functions. It is not for

us to sit in judgment on the wisdom or the propriety of this regulation; it is sufficient for us to know that such was the *will of God.* We are sure that no such regulation belongs to the Christian system. No man can claim the ministry as his right, his inheritance, because his father, and his ancestors for generations past, have served the Church and their God in the holy office. No man can allege, as his call to the ministry, an audible voice from heaven designating him by name to this important work. The man who can furnish no other and no better evidence of his call to the ministry than visions and voices which he pretends to have seen and heard, exhibits intellectual and moral blemishes which ought as certainly to exclude him from the ministry, as the natural blemishes, found on the sons of Aaron, did from the priesthood. He is to submit his call to the careful examination of those by whom he is to be ordained; but as they can judge of nothing but external evidence; as they do not posses the faculty of searching the heart, he may deceive them by statements which have no truth, and by professions which have no reality. He is not, and cannot really be called to the ministry without genuine, scriptural piety; let his other qualifications be what they may, this is indispensable. Others may judge of his talents and learning, but the decision respecting his piety rests chiefly between himself and his God, who "searches the heart." By imposing upon others he may gain admittance to the ministry without piety; he may be the able and the learned advocate of Christianity; he may preach the truth to the edification of others; yet he himself will be "*a castaway.*"

He who enters the ministry without piety, must be moved, not by the Holy Spirit, whose aid he rejects, whose influences he resists, but by some selfish motives; and all such motives are criminal. Pride is one of these motives. He may be conscious of intellectual powers above mediocrity, his mind may be richly stored from the treasures of literature, and he may desire the sacred office as a suitable theatre for the display of those excellencies. He may consider them calculated to excite, not only approbation, but the highest degree of admira-

tion; and he will, therefore, consider himself entitled to this admiration as the just reward of his merit. This paramount desire will regulate, as far as possible, the choice of his audience, the selection of his subject, the ornaments of his style, the tone of his voice, and everything relating to his delivery; all will be adapted to gain the definite object he has in view. Most probably he will be successful, for men generally are more easily pleased, than led to obey the gospel; are a thousand times more ready to give their admiration to exhibitions of talent, of learning, and of eloquence, than to give their hearts to God. Such a mind, having the facts, the doctrines, the precepts, the examples, the rewards and punishments of Christianity as its materials, will not fail of success; verily he shall have his reward. The fixed attention, the countenance of pleasure, the eye moistened with tears of sympathy, will feed and nourish his pride, and prompt him to renewed efforts of this kind; for pride is as insatiable as the grave, continually crying, "*give, give,*" and never saith "*it is enough.*" Those who furnish this food may be rapidly sinking to perdition, or ripening for heaven; this is not a concern of his; all he covets is their admiration. This is *strange fire* in a servant of the *meek and lowly* Saviour; yet it is the fire with which many a one enters the house of God.

Another considers the office of the ministry as, in some degree, honorable; and vanity, a paltry kind of pride, peculiar to weak minds, prompts him to desire it on this account. The respect which may be paid, from the best of motives, to the office which he fills, he will receive as offered to himself. An humble and pious man would consider this respect as given for the sake of the office which he fills, and of the Master whom he serves. The vain man, however, is unwilling or unable to perceive this distinction, and therefore receives it as the tribute paid to his own consequence. This is another specimen of "*strange fire.*"

There is yet another who desires the office on account of the worldly maintainance which he expects to receive with it. This desire will, of course gradute his efforts; he will

perform just as much, or more properly, just as little ministerial service as will secure this support. Beyond this point he has no motives, stirring his spirit within him, to make a single effort. He acts on the principle of *quid pro quo*, of value received in dollars and cents, for all that he does. The principle which led the Saviour to die for sinners, which led Paul to spend and be spent in the cause of his master, has no place in his heart. Although the office be, in fact, *a work;* a work, too, the fatigues, anxieties and labors of which have brought many a valuable life to a premature end, yet he is determined to make it a life of ease. He will not *be righteous overmuch; for why should he destroy himself.* Whatever the other charges may be which are alleged against the people of the United States, certainly it is not one of them that they hold out many inducements of this kind to enter the ministry. Yet weak as these inducements generally are, to a mind without piety they may be sufficient; little as he may expect, it may be more than he would receive, without more laborious efforts, from any other occupation. This again is "*strange fire*," in one who professes to imitate the example, and be the servant of Him who "*had not where to lay his head.*"

Here is yet another man who presents himself to the public view in the ministerial office; the spirit that moves him is the spirit of party. The chief object in view, is to add names to the catalogue of his own denomination. This supreme desire of his heart characterizes his preaching, his conversation, and whole deportment. He claims for himself and his party the exclusive, even the *jure-divino* right, to proselyte the world to the use of his own *shibboleth.* With this authority he will use argument and persuasion; if these fail to answer his purpose, by the same authority he will then anathematize, cut of from the covenanted mercy of God those who will not be persuaded. With permission to make a slight alteration, he will use the language in which Paul breathed out the pious feelings of his heart: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be" proselyted, might be followers of me, as I am of the party to which I belong. His zeal is ardent, his labors are indefatigable, his preaching is anything,

and everything, within his power, that will best answer his purpose. While the humble, the pious and devoted pastor, who considers nothing as evidence of his usefulness, who will be satisfied with no other proofs of piety but "repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," manifested by habitual and cheerful obedience to the gospel; while he is weeping in secret because "men keep not the law of God," and is pouring out his complaint in the language of an ancient prophet: "Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" the other refers to the number of names added to his catalogue as the proof of his success; and holding up to public view this catalogue, thus swelled, exultingly proclaims, in the language of another distinguished individual mentioned in the Old Testament, "Come with me, and see my zeal for the Lord." In this man's spirit there is fire indeed, but it is *strange*, very "*strange fire*," in one who professes to be a teacher of *meekness*, *of peace*, *of forbearance and brotherly love*, *of kindness and of charity.*

That Jehovah-Jesus who has instituted the ministry for the salvation of sinners, for the promotion of his kingdom, is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." He requires as strictly now as in the days of Aaron to be "sanctified in them that come nigh him," and to be "glorified before all the people." No talents, no learning, no morality, no profession, no zeal, no consecration to office, can be a substitute for piety in a minister of the gospel. Everything else is "*strange fire.*" Supreme love to God is the fire which should warm the heart of the minister of Christ. Borne away through the labors of his office by this constraining motive, whatever visible success may attend his efforts, his services will be acceptable to God, "a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish." This faithful man, "though Israel be not saved" by his ministry, though his warning and entreaties should only aggravate the guilt of impenitent sinners, yet verily "shall in no wise lose his reward."

ARTICLE III.

THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

By Rev. Joel Swartz, D. D., Carlisle, Pa.,

By the spirit of the age, we mean its character and tendencies, or, more strictly, those forces of every kind within it, which, in their combination, produce its distinguishing features and peculiarities. That there are certain distinct periods in the world's history which are characterized by the prevalence of some single idea, for the time, or some definite combination of controlling influences which stamp the age with a separateness and individuality, will scarcely be questioned by any one who has even a superficial knowledge of its great epochs. These periods may be regarded as more or less extended in space and duration; more or less important according as they are viewed with respect to certain results, or from different points of observation; but from every point of view, and with respect to any great result, the past is not a calm and quiescent scene, but like the troubled sea upon which the four winds of heaven, as in the vision of Daniel, are seen to strive with each other, and the spirit of its ages may be seen symbolized in the lions, the bears, and the leopards that come up out of its agitations. As in the causes which disturb the sea, so in the affairs of men there are conjunctions of attracting forces that swell their billows either into the high tide, or, separating into opposition, leave them to break low on the shore. Or, more local and irregular impulses may sweep their wild march across the centuries in particular localities, as the storms chase the waves over the sea, rolling up its depths, while other points may sleep in silence and quiet under the presiding genius of repose.

To any one who looks at the mere surface-play of these wild and seemingly lawless forces, and not deep enough to

see that, however the waves are divided, they are still one as the sea, the restless past may appear a scene of unmeaning confusion—of motion without continuity or design. And it is not strange that those who, reading only of wars and revolutions, the rise and fall of empires and civilizations, of philosophies and religions, where the wicked often seem to triumph, and the good are oppressed, and caring not, or being unable, to connect these fearful undulations with some broader and deeper purpose which every change is slowly but surely working out, should deny that there is any Providence in history, or any hope for humanity. Many an observer of the apparently meaningless unrest of history, especially as seen only in a narrow view and on the surface, has turned with a sort of sea-sickness from the dark and confounding scene, and lost his faith in God and his confidence in humanity. But it is perfectly certain that a broader view and deeper insight into the spirit of the ages reveals the fact, that there *is* a God in history, who presides over its revolutions, and with each successive change advances mankind on the plane of progress to some brighter destination in the future. There is a God "which stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves and the tumult of the people;" and though his "way is in the sea, and his path in the great waters," yet a devout and studious eye that looks across its dark billows, may see in their illuminated crests the wake of His holy feet. It is from the eminence of the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, and from this alone, that the observer of the ways of men, and the history of nations, can get any correct view of the grand scheme which God is working out through the perverse and rebellious freedom of the race. It is nothing less than the coronation of His Son, whom He hath set as "King upon His holy hill of Zion." To Him has He given "the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession." And now the heathen may rage, and the kings and rulers of the earth may "take counsel together against the Lord and against His anointed," yet they shall be made either to "kiss the Son" or "perish from the way when His wrath is kindled but a little." For

He *must* reign until all "principality and power and might and dominion" be put "under His feet" and He be acknowledged "Head over all things to the Church." The grand doctrine that this world is governed in the interests of Christianity, is that which unifies and interprets the whole problem of history. About the cross of Jesus Christ all confusion crystalizes into order, all variety into unity, and elemental strife combines into a perfect and divine harmony. "The incarnation of God in Christ," says Dr. J. H. Kurtz, (Ch. Hist. p. 42,) "for the salvation of the human race, which had become subject to sin and death and eternal misery, forms the central point in the history and development of mankind. The process of preparation for this, dates from the earliest times, and appeared under the two-fold form of *Heathenism* and *Judaism.* These respective forms continued side by side with each other, until, in the fulness of time, they merged into Christianity, which they were mutually to serve by their appropriate fruits and results and respectively peculiar developments." Heathenism, with its classic and philosophic culture, wrought out the elaborate silver basket into which Christianity, prepared in Judaism, afterwards dropped its apple of gold.

There can, consequently, be no satisfactory or intelligent study of the history of the world, or any of its ages, apart from the all-pervading and all-controlling spirit of Christianity. In some form, and under some aspect or modification, this is the spirit of every age. Without this organizing and informing principle, history is a huge monster, and the ages, which are its members, are without beauty or relation of parts. And in proportion as this principle enters into and organizes history, in that proportion will its parts become symmetrical and its whole intelligible. And as in the course of the progressive development of the purposes of God in history, it would seem almost necessary that our own age should present higher evidences of completeness than earlier periods, we ought to expect a fuller manifestation of Christianity in our own than in any former times. And we believe this is the fact. We know there are many who, influ-

enced either by some peculiar theological opinions which require a continued degeneracy towards "the last times," or by a certain melancholy and moroseness of temper, which leads them always to look on the dark side of things, declaim against our age as one of increasing and unbounded wickedness. They think the world is becoming so bad, that unless God, in some extraordinary way, interposes to save it, he will, in justice, have to destroy it, as he did in the days of Noah, or as he overwhelmed, with fire, the cities of the plain. Persons of this temper praise "the olden times." They are those whom Horace calls, "*Laudatores temporis acti.*" Solomon speaks of them as bewailing the age in which he lived. They complainingly inquired, "What is the cause that the former days were better than these?" No matter in what period of the world they live, they are always looking to "the former days." To such persons any cheerful and hopeful view of the present age, especially if it present the past in the shade of an unfavorable comparison, seems like a sort of profane love of novelty and destructive radicalism. They love to look away from the rude and vulgar scenes which the near present presents to the view, and, piercing through the soft and golden haze which time and distance alike spread over the appearance of remote objects, contemplate the pleasing enchantment as a sort of golden age, in which men lived together in a love of each other and piety towards God, which, alas, have now somehow abandoned the world. And without stopping to reflect that, "'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view," they immediately and sadly begin to inquire, "What is the cause?" Without concluding so suddenly that the former days *were* better than these, it would be well to remember the gentle rebuke which Solomon administered to these *croakers* in his age, "Thou dost not inquire wisely concerning this." It is well to inquire first into the *fact*, and then it is time to search for the "cause." But, whilst we have no sympathy with those who think all wisdom and virtue are to be sought in "the former days," we as little sympathize with those who look upon the men of former times as having necessarily lived in ages, compared with this,

of ignorance and semi-barbarism. Excited by the progress of science, art and invention in the nineteenth century, there are those who seem to look upon the men who lived before this age of railroads and telegraphs as so unhappily situated, and so fettered by their circumstances, as to have been necessarily incapacitated for those profounder judgments and broader views, which we, in this favored age, are permitted to make. Consequently, they attach but little authority to their opinions, and have but little respect for their judgments. That there may have been giants in those days, they will admit, but then they were men of rude and barbarous strength, who deserve no great consideration in comparison with the graceful masters and polished thinkers of to-day.

Now, if we were to permit ourselves to be biased by either of these untruthful and perverting prejudices—either by a weak veneration for the "former days," or a supercilious conceit of the superior wisdom of the present, we should be incapable of estimating the spirit of the present age. Neither that which is ancient nor that which is modern, deserves our admiration from the circumstance simply that it is old or new, but its merit depends upon its essential and inherent goodness and truthfulness. A modern truth is infinitely older than the most ancient falsehood. Truth is eternal.

It will be ours to inquire what *is* the spirit of the age, not what it *ought* to be. That we have already intimated a favorable judgment of the present age we admit, and we feel that this judgment is not without foundation in fact, but we trust we are free, in making it, from both a blind conservatism and a fanatical radicalism.

Directed by the principles and guarded by the cautions thus far advanced, we are prepared to define "The Spirit of the Age," in a single general expression, as being a spirit of *universal brotherhood and common humanity.*

Of course, we do not pretend to say that the doctrine of our universal brotherhood and common humanity, is in any way the discovery of the present age. The fact that we are all made of one blood, that we all have one divine and one human father, and that, consequently, the whole race of man-

kind has a common brotherhood, was revealed in the beginning and was, in sundry times and in divers manners, reiterated afterwards in the only authentic history of our origin and guide to our destiny. Those Darwinian and protoplastic philosophers who seem specially ambitious to find their parentage among the brute progenitors of the forest and the fold, and by the use of pretentious terms of science, try to shame the Christian out of his simple confidence that he was made, by an orignal act of creation, in the image of God, teach doctrines which tend to loosen the ties of our common kindredship and resolve us into a herd of improved animals, with as mean an origin and low attachments and dark a destiny, as the beasts that perish. And though here and there the age is producing monstrous theories subversive of the anthropology of the Bible, and the sympathies and hopes of Christians, yet the ancient doctrine of our fatherhood in God, and our brotherhood in man, was never so deeply impressed and so generally believed and so practically accepted among men as to-day. The age has not discovered this doctrine, but it has more emphatically and practically recognized it than ever before.

The bigoted Jew, though taught these doctrines in his scriptures, practically disowned them by his hatred of Samaritans and his comtempt for gentiles. The ignorant heathen by his castes cuts up the social bond into many hideous and fragmentary sections. And even Christians have often shown but little more charity, in their contempt and dislike of races among them of different nationality and complexions from themselves. And pride and wealth have often led them to make grades and castes among themselves inconsistent with the dictates of reason and the claims of Christian brotherhood. Now, however, it is a matter of fact, and one specially characteristic of this age, that the old social barriers, are giving way, the artificial and unnatural partitions erected, and so long continued between the nations of the earth, and the citizens of the same country, are breaking down, and the people, the whole people, are coming into the apprehension of the long ignored and long forgotten truth, that God

is no respecter of persons, and that all mankind are brethren. A deep conviction is fastening itself upon the universal consciousness, that the lowest and most despised, after all, are men, and that the highest and most honored are nothing more. And hence it is, that the most degraded and oppressed are asking for themselves the rights and privileges of their manhood, and the most tyrannical and despotic fear to refuse the solemn and equitable demand. Long, indeed, has the leaven of that simple but sublime truth uttered by Jesus in the hearing of his fishermen disciples, "All ye are brethren," seemed to lie forgotten in the great mass of humanity, but it has been silently working and spreading, and to-day it is the most noticeable and most transforming and most energetic principle in society. It is coming out with all the freshness and visibility of a new truth. And look where you will, you will behold modified forms of its activity. A few of these may be noticed as proofs and illustrations of our general subject.

1. *It is seen in the free and unrestricted intercourse of mankind.* Time was when the nations were hemmed in, as Tacitus expresses it, "by mountains and mutual fear." But these barriers no longer confine men within their narrow, native borders. Laborious, curious and rapid means of communication have brought the distant parts of the earth into close neighborhood and common wants and common interests cement them together in bonds of fellowship stronger than the iron bands and electric cables which connect their lands and shores. The old prejudices of nationality, language, laws and religion, are no longer sufficient to keep the restless nations apart and convert all who live beyond a mountain or a river into deadly foes; but disregarding old and hereditary feuds and jealousies, the citizen leaves his home and sails the seas, and crosses the continents, following the beck of pleasure or or fortune, he settles among men of strange manners, language, customs and of a different complexion from himself, and is enrolled as a citizen among his newly chosen kindred, and identifies himself with them in all social and civil relations. It is interesting and instructive to notice the un-

checked tides of emigration, rolling over all ancient boundaries, and despite all the obstacles of nature and the restraints of despotism, and flooding the shores of strange and distant climes, and mingling as the waves of the sea, into one great ocean of fraternity and fellowship. It is evident that in this contact and friction of heterogenous nationalities and civilizations, the sharp angularities of peculiar and hostile individualisms must be broken off and smoothed down, and the different children of the same family, brought into a unity of sympathy and love, such as Christianity clearly contemplates and will ultimately produce.

2. Another characteristic of the age and illustration of common brotherhood is, *the growing sense among the masses of men of their equal right to the blessings of freedom and the pursuit of happiness.* Until within a comparatively recent period of the world's history, we read only of kings and popes, of statesmen and warriors. If we hear of the other people at all, it is only in masses as so many serfs and soldiers, who are to do the bidding, pay the taxes and fight the battles of their imperious masters.

But that state of things has greatly changed, is changing, and is destined to greater changes still. We now begin to read of "the sovereign people." It is "the people" who now appear as prominent actors on the great arena of the world's history. The wicked and crafty pretension of kings and popes, being appointed to govern, tax and oppress their subjects by a special, "divine right," is being everywhere looked into, and in many places has come to be thoroughly understood by the people as a monstrous and blasphemous falsehood, and they have arisen in their might and hurled these arrogant pretenders from their places of power, and instead, have placed men chosen from themselves, and by themselves, in authority, to govern according to constitutions framed and adopted by themselves. Our noble Declaration of Independence, in a period when the doctrine of popular rights was not nearly so well understood by the masses of men as now, announced as self-evident truths, the propositions, "That all men are created free and equal, and are endowed by their

Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." If these truths *are* self-evident, it is strange that mankind never discovered them, and that they are gathered only from revelation, and that when stated even there, they were practically denied and disowned by many who professed to derive their "divine right" to rule from this very source, and it is strange that these truths, even to-day, need so much elaborate proof and illustration. It is strange that even the people who framed this Declaration, incorporated the inhuman outrage of chattel slavery into their own government, and that the very people who, in their annual celebrations of the adoption of this document as containing the principles and vindication of free institutions, read its sublime utterances over and over, in the presence of millions of human beings, to whom they denied every one of the rights asserted to be "inalienable." And it is strange, too, that millions of our own Christian people, and among them some of our most learned divines, labored with all the resources of honest sophistry and perverse biblical interpretations, to prove the very reverse of these "self-evident truths." And even yet, after the terrible logic of a civil war, waged for four long, bloody years, against the abominable lie of slavery, and God's awful adjudication of the case in controversy, there are many poor deluded souls, many of them learned and honest, who still contend against these "self-evident truths." *Are* these truths self-evident? They are evident after a great deal of proof and vivid demonstration, but not without them. And it is, therefore, not without reason that the nations of the earth are anxiously looking to these shores to see if the doctrine of popular rights and equality, announced in our Declaration, is anything more than a plausible falsehood and sentimental delusion. And it is due, very largely, to that measure of practical illustration which we have afforded of the truth of our own fair theory, that the nations of the old world have, in late years, been agitated with such deep and wide-spread unrest. And the day does not seem to very distant, when the deep seated agi-

tations swelling up from every stratum of society, even the very lowest, will finally prostrate every form of despotic government, both civil and ecclesiastical. "Even the most abject portions of society are visited by dreams of a better condition for which they were created. The grand doctrine that every human being should have the means of self-culture, of knowledge, of virtue, of comfort and happiness; of exercising all the affections and powers of a man; this is slowly taking its place as the highest social truth. That the world was made for all, and not for a few—that society is to care for all, that no human being is to perish but through his own fault, that the great end of government is to spread a shield of equal protection over the rights of all—these are propositions that are growing into axioms, and the spirit of them is coming forth in all the departments of life." "To-day if we cast our eyes over Europe, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, from the mouth of the Seine to the mouth of the Danube, we find that all the movements of courts and cabinets, fleets and armies; that the most prominent and numerous discussions in the senate and by the press; that the most intense and earnest feelings among the masses of men, all move in obedience to one central inspiration, which, breathing into every heart some new conviction of its organic fellowship with other hearts in a brotherhood of unity and equality, binds all movements together as gravitation binds the planets to the sun."

It is this spirit of the age which has stripped Pio Nono of his temporal possessions, and made the once terrible thunders of the Vatican the sport and jest of all right thinking men. The pretentious and blasphemous declaration of papal infallibility, were it not for its wickedness, would be looked upon as "the hugest joke" of the age. And the excommunications which, in the thirteenth century, would have made such men as Victor Emanuel and Dr. Döllinger outlaws and outcasts from society, and subjected all who might dare to perform for them the most ordinary offices of humanity to all odiums and penalties, are now looked upon as simply very profane utterances of the impotent rage of a superstitious old man.

It is the same spirit of popular freedom, which is also the spirit of the age, which has driven Isabella from Spain, and Bonaparte, with his celebrated "Prince Imperial," from France.

3. Another hopeful and prominent characteristic of the age, is the fact that *the common masses of mankind are coming into the enjoyment of the blessings of a good education and true refinement.* A few centuries ago, nearly all that was called learning in the world, was shut up in a few colleges and universities, where learned professors delivered their erudite lectures to a favored few, who had the wealth and the leisure to enjoy their instructions, whilst the humble masses were left without even the rudiments of an education. Books were so few and so costly that the poor could not expect to possess them, whilst such a novelty as the modern, and now indispensible, newspaper, magazine and review, was not thought of. It is certainly very difficult, for us of the present day, to imagine how men could bear to live in such gloomy and cheerless times, or what would now be the state of society could all these means of popular enlightenment and entertainment be taken away.

Now, however, the beneficent genius of culture and refinement, having escaped from her long imprisonment in the monk's cloister and the professor's lecture room, where she was compelled to give forth her scanty utterances in the hampered speech of a dead language, goes forth free, as God intended her to be, bright as the rising sun, and with beams of light almost as diffusive as they, speaking the language of the millions, visiting the cottage as well as the palace, and, whilst uttering the technical speech of science to the student, she tells her useful lessons of knowledge around the hearths of the poor, and prattles her first lessons in the nursery of childhood. Over all the hillsides, and along all the valleys, does she delight to lead millions of our joyful youth, with satchel and books and "shining morning faces," no longer "creeping slowly and unwillingly to school," to the neat and tasteful and well ventilated school-houses which she has taught her favored children to rear, and whose walls she

adorns with her curious maps and charts, from which the well-pleased eyes of childhood steal many a valuable and unconscious lesson. Her almost countless dailies, weeklies, quarterlies, her books and pictures, made attractive with every tasteful device of art, give profitable employment and exalted pleasure to millions who produce, or sell, or read and study them. Thus it is that, from every fountain of thought, there flow down streams of refreshing among the millions of men as free as the brooks that sing by their doors, and from which all may as freely partake and feel in the inspiring draught a community and fellowship with the unknown source. Even the poor slave, whom it was once a punishable offence to teach the reading of God's word, may now, free as his master, press to his eager lips the long proscribed cup of knowledge. Ku Klux incendiaries may burn his humble school-house and murder his missionary teacher, but they cannot stop the tide of popular enlightenment, or restrict its privileges to the old, aristocratic classes. Exalted to the rank of a citizen, with the old stigma of natural inferiority blotted out, the former slave will yet prove his right to be ranked among the common brotherhood of his species and vindicate his equality, by his culture and capacity, and mayhap, shall yet teach those who would now enforce his ignorance, the science of equitable government, the rudiments of religion and the lessons of charity. We may not deny any future of good even to the most humble and despised who show a love and capacity for study, endurance and sobriety, and it is perfectly certain that the solid acquirements of education and the adornments of piety cannot forever be held in subjection to a mere prejudice of color. The superiority of solid culture, to the mere glitter of its affectation, may be seen on a grand scale in recent affairs. France and Prussia are examples. If there is one possible and satisfactory explanation for the rapid, uniform and unprecedented success of Prussia in her conflict with France, it is found in the fact that the former led into the war an educated Protestant soldiery, made efficient, self-reliant and brave by the humanizing and Christianizing influences of an unsurpassed system of

popular education and the blessings of a free Bible, against a people naturally intelligent and courageous, but ill-governed and priest-ridden, without the advantages of a useful education and the blessings of an evangelical religion. The soldier in the one army was a free citizen of a Protestant country, in that of the other he was a virtual bondman in a land swayed by infidelity and priest-craft. And the result is a comment upon the merits of the respective systems of training. And nothing augurs more hopefully for the ultimate triumph of education and Christianity over the darkness of popular ignorance and papal superstition, than the immense advantage which Protestant Prussia had in the late war with papal and infidel France. In all future conflicts, where common schools and the Bible are brought into collision with ignorance and superstition, it will not be difficult to predict the result. This tendency of the age is begotten of inspiration, has its source in the common Fatherhood of God, and is destined to bring into manifestation the brotherhood of man.

4. Another characteristic of the age, and illustrating our general proposition, is *the catholicity of Christian sentiment and the spirit of mutual toleration and growing fellowship in all the Churches and through all the lands of Christendom.* It would seem eminently appropriate, indeed, that those who profess a religion whose benign spirit teaches love even to enemies and good will to all men, the fruit of whose possession in the heart is love of the brethren, and whose great design is to realize the brotherhood of the race, should exhibit among themselves a spirit of fraternity and charity. But it is a sad commentary upon the darkness of the human mind, and the depravity of the human heart, that the professed disciples of Jesus should, in His own name, have persecuted those of the common household, and even when shedding their blood, thought they were doing God service. It is humiliating to know that the dungeon, the stake and the scaffold have been called into such fearful and frequent requisition by those whose business is was to bear with the weak among themselves, and to seek and save the lost, but who were more jealous of some vague tradition, some human interpretation of a text, or some

declared point of orthodoxy, than they were for the essential and chief grace of charity and the salvation of immortal souls. And one of the longest and darkest chapters in the history of the Church, is a record of its ignorance and bigotry and cruelty. Christian men have been slow to learn that, of all heresies, the greatest and most damning is uncharitableness. It is perfectly certain, that one of the greatest duties of the Christian teacher and believer, is to "contend earnestly for the faith as it was once delivered to the saints," and it is also certain, that it is only a pure gospel which can subdue the natural enmity of the heart and produce the sublime charity which suffereth long and is kind, which is not easily provoked, and thinketh no evil, for it is this charity that "rejoiceth in the truth." And it were false to this charity and treacherous to men, who so much need its blessings, to concede any of its precious truths to error, and for the sake of a mere outward peace and a false unity, to compromise its fundamental principles. This is all true, and yet it ought to be remembered that charity is *love*, and that grace is greater than either faith or hope. It is possible in understanding to be most rigidly and technically orthodox, and yet in spirit to be an arch heretic, for "the end of the commandment is charity," and all orthodoxy that does not bear this last and most perfect fruit in the heart and life, is false and deceitful. Every evidence, therefore, of increasing respect and good will among Christians for each other, despite minor diversities of belief, is a cheering indication of a better and sounder faith as well as a more Christ-like spirit. Every lover of Christ and the race for which he died, cannot but rejoice to-day in the increasing "love of the brethren," and the emphatic demonstration of it to be seen in their hearty and mutual fellowship, regardless of names and minor differences of creed. It is to be hoped that the disgrace and sin of pains and penalties inflicted for honest differences of belief, are never to stain the record of the Church again. They are among "the former things" that have passed away. And we bless God that even that theological rancor, which has for a long time survived the stake, and still often disgraces religious controver-

sy and makes the "odium theologorum" the reproach of the Church, is now almost universally condemned by Christians, as unworthy of their profession and a disgrace to their cause, and that the whole spirit of controversy is despised as unprofitable and vain. And Christian sentiment demands now, that if discussion must be had, it shall be conducted without bitterness, and with good will for the opponent. The spirit of the age will tolerate almost anything better than intolerance. It loves nothing more than love. And if any one hopes to gain favor with the Christian sentiment of the age, and to lay a strong hold upon the world as it now is, he must consent to let his peculiar dogmas and distinctive peculiarities, however prominent they may seem to be to his microscopical vision, sink down to their just relation to the whole globe of truth, even as the tallest mountains sink into almost unnoticeable ridges when viewed in relation to the mass of the earth. It is coming to be understood that, just in proportion as a man succeeds in giving an undue prominence to his peculiarity, in that proportion he destroys the symmetry and soundness of the whole. Large and liberal minds are coming to understand, more and more, that truth is a great and beautiful sphere of properly related and adjusted truths, and that it requires a broad sweep of vision and much patient travel, to compass its whole extent and inspect its several parts. And those who see clearest and have traveled farthest, are most ready to admit that even its seeming antipodes may stand with their feet towards the same centre and may bask in the light of the same sun and may be canopied by the same stars. Exclusive little sects of high-churchmen and close-communionists, like aphides, may crawl over their few inches of space and, ascending their favorite little stalks and gaining a vision of a few familiar feet around, boast that they have surveyed the globe, and proclaim all beyond their inspection, either as having no existence, or as being impossible. But their arrogance can have no other effect than to flatter their own ignorance, and procure for them the ridicule of better observers. Microscopical minds of this character, are not in harmony with the enlarged spirit

of the times, and can accomplish but little for humanity as it now is.

5. In our estimation of the tendencies of the times, and as illustrative of their spirit, we ought not to overlook *that wide-spread and leveling institution, the modern Sabbath School.* In this primary institution, an influence is exerted upon the rising generation which will most intimately link the future adult populations of our age and country into a community of interests and sympathies. The uniformity of the best methods of teaching, and the unrestricted diffusion of the best literature for youth throughout the schools of the land, are silently and surely unifying Christian Churches in doctrine and fellowship. And with a strong conviction that the children of the poorest and most vicious are immortal beings and kindred to ourselves, they are sought for with a commendable diligence and are brought under the teachings of the gospel at that very age when they are most susceptible of its divine influences. And it is just here where we find most beautifully and most powerfully illustrated the unity of Christian belief in the doctrine of our common depravity and common need, as sinners, and our common salvation only in Christ. Upon this basis Christians can work together. Once it was thought an unwarrantable assumption for laymen to presume to teach the gospel, which it was supposed was committed to ordained ecclesiastics as the only authorized expounders of its truths. But now there are found thousands of holy men and women teaching publicly, Sabbath after Sabbath, in the house of the Lord, with no other ordination for their work than the love of Christ in their hearts and the unction of the Holy Ghost in their souls. It is now understood that a divinely appointed ministry does by no means supersede the necessity of lay teaching, or exclude the humblest servant of the Master from the privilege of inviting sinners to Christ. "Let him that heareth say, Come."

Thus, then, we see a spirit at work in our times, so marked and characteristic of our very age, that before its diffusive and transforming power, all the old and exclusive monopolies of what God intended to be the common privileges and ben-

efits of all, are breaking down and giving way, and the people, untitled and unhonored, are demanding, and actually appropriating as their own, what was once claimed and enjoyed by the few. A wide-spread democracy, in state and church, is rising up and changing old customs and abolishing old prerogatives and substituting for them measures and instrumentalities of their own, to be used or altered by themselves, as their wisdom or interests may dictate. And he who stands in the way of this movement, is sure to be overwhelmed in the agitations which his resistance may produce. He might as well, like an old foolish English king, expect to stay the tides of the sea by a command or threat.

It is not wonderful that timid old conservatives should have their fears about the results of this unceremonious breaking down of old barriers and the elevation of the masses. "Can the people be trusted?" that is the anxious question. And even the most hopeful and radical cannot but know that popular uprisings and popular institutions are capable of fearful abuse. And one cannot but feel fearful that the ignorant subjects of newly acquired power, may greatly abuse their liberties. These fears are entertained by many in our own land, in view of the political power acquired by those who a short time ago were ignorant slaves. And yet it may be some assuagement of the fears excited by this great political change, to know that despots and masters, no less than their subjects, are capable of abusing their power, and that our former slaves are not likely to make their own condition worse than what it was before their emancipation, or involve us in worse trouble than what we had on their account while we held them as slaves. With our thorough persuasion of the doctrine of "total depravity," of which kings and popes and despots generally have given us abundant evidence, we are persuaded that it is as safe to trust the people with their own interests as to trust them to self-constituted or hereditary masters. And whilst we expect to see abuses of power, whether lodged with the people or with their masters, yet, as the people learn to know their interests and

their proper management, (as they only can and will when they have the charge of them,) we shall expect to have fewer wars and lighter burdens than when contrived by those who expected to share none of their evils. "War is a game at which kings would not play if their subjects were wise." The tendency of the age, therefore, is a tendency towards universal peace. As man comes to feel, more and more, his brotherhood in man, he will lose his disposition to treat him as an enemy. The tendency of the age is tendency towards universal equality, and the time will yet come when we shall call no man master or lord, and when those who would be greatest among men, must consent, as the only means to such an end, to become the servants of all.

We are all perfectly aware that the sea, in this direction, is not smooth; we know that the winds are often contrary; many hidden rocks lie under the surface, and humanity is to wreck many a fond hope before the inviting and yet distant haven is reached. But the star of hope hangs steadily in that direction, and, by the favor of God, the toiling millions will yet come to land. We thank God we live in an age whose skies are so bright and are drifting on a sea so smooth, and when the gales are so prosperous. We cannot but rejoice to see the wreck of so many stately old crafts, whose freight was weary cargoes of slaves. And it is no small part of our satisfaction to see, hung off against the skies, flags of distress, showing that many more, of like character, are breaking with the waves. In short, with much sympathy for unfortunate individuals, we are glad to read of the troubles of infallible popes and exiled and captured Napoleons, of the flying of Isabellas, and even the waning Victorias and the Williams—Emperors, "by the grace of God." We welcome the people into the foreground of the brightening picture which our faith sees in the coming future, whilst we contemplate without regret, the retiring and diminishing figures of earth's sceptered and titled nobility. With no gift of the seer, but aided only by the light of the present and the dim but divine intimations of God's Word, our vision catches the coming of an age, in which we behold millions of equal forms advancing

into the foreground, blending in fellowship and love, without consciousness of differing nationalities, complexions or castes, all uniting in acts of mutual service and divine homage; all war having ceased, all discord having ended, and all tyrannies and despotisms having perished on the earth, we hear the shout of triumph ascending from the whole fraternal multitude, as they cry: "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them and they shall be His people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."

Let no desponding misanthrope sit down with retrospective glances into the past and say, "What is the cause," but, rising from his sloth, let him look hopefully into the coming future, and take deep inspiration of its coming gales. They will fill his heart with hope, and his soul with strength. Especially, let no young man yield to the unnerving platitudes of complainers who say that "the times are hard and bad," and that "the world is getting worse and worse." Let him stand upon his feet and look abroad; let him prostrate himself on his knees, and look up, and he will get heart to believe that neither is the earth brass nor the heavens iron, but the field before will be seen to be white with a tempting harvest, and voices from the sky above him will call to him to thrust in his sickle and gather sheaves unto everlasting life. Certain it is, that the present age, with all its hindrances and drawbacks, presents to every aspiring and earnest young man a scope of useful activity as broad as the most unbounded ambition could covet, and rewards as bright as those which imagination ever conceived, and he is an eleventh hour idler, who still stands in the market place excusing himself from labor because no man hath hired him. The times are *not* adverse, but propitious. And the field is an open and inviting and perishing world. Let him go in and labor, and whatever is right shall be given him. Let others complain of "hard times and nothing to do," if they will, but let the lover of Christ, and the brother of man, be but willing to work, and the beneficent genius of the age, with a finger of light, shall point his way to hills crowned with light and fields green with immortality.

ARTICLE IV.

EDUCATION, ITS AIMS AND RESULTS.

By Rev. W. M. Baum, D. D., York, Pa.

In every age, and with every nation, *Education* has been, and is, a question of surpassing importance. The field of inquiry is alike extensive and difficult. Study and observation, however protracted and searching, have not, as yet, exhausted it, nor even satisfied its thirsting explorers. Hydra-headed difficulties spring forth along the whole line of progress, and battles, not a few nor feeble, have attended the achievements of its ambitious advocates. But, however discouraging the prospect, at particular times, and in certain localities, the result is neither doubtful nor uncertain. Though positive hostility may show itself against the modes and means employed, the desirableness and value of the end attained, cannot be questioned. The educator will ever be held in high esteem, and his work receive, as it deserves, the unqualified approval and commendation of his own and succeeding generations.

When we bear in mind the long period of years through which this science has been studied and practiced, the untold thousands who have given it their life-study, the boundless fields for experiment and observation, and the unquestioned ability and unchallenged disinterestedness of those who have conducted these investigations, we cannot but be amazed at the fewness of the established principles reached. There has never been a lack of theories, nor a want of expounders, but no one age has yet been found willing to accept the positions or adopt the results of the preceding, nor even been content with the system under which it was itself educated.

There is, however, this one grain of consolation to be derived from this rather discouraging and gloomy representation. To all educators we would say, Your work is not upon

a finished nor exhausted field, your profession is not one into which no daring explorer need venture with hope of achieving new and important results. There are all the attractions and promise of an untraveled territory lying before you, and you are invited to press forward and bring into the storehouse of general information, the principles and features of this science, from personal experiment and original research. Though you enter the list at a late day in the world's history, you may still be pioneers, and in due time be enrolled among the patriarchs of education.

A misconception upon the general subject of education, as to its true idea and intent, confronts us at the very threshold of our discussion, and is of sufficient magnitude to demand a brief consideration. By many there is no proper distinction observed or allowed between Education and Instruction. According to their view, to be educated means simply to be made a resrvoir for the facts and figures of the sciences, and for the dates and deeds of history. The man, therefore, of the most tenacious memory, holding, like an encyclopædia, or a concordance, or a dictionary, the most elaborate definitions and scientific statements, the most intricate formulas and results of study, is necessarily the man of the most finished education. From this view we are compelled to dissent. Let it once be understood that instructicn is only a means, whilst education is the end—that to know is one thing, to be educated quite another; that the one is oft the merest superficiality whilst the other is always thorough and profound, and there will be less impatience on the part of students and patrons, and much less imposition and pretension, (and if we may use a rough but expressive word,) there will be much less humbuggery among professional teachers. Education is not so much *a pouring into* the student, as it is *a drawing forth;* it is *training* more than *teaching.* Its chief aim and intent are to reveal and develop and exercise the power of thought, to call forth and stimulate and direct the unused, latent capacity of the mind, to instruct and guide and discipline the will, and to arouse, cultivate, nourish, nurse, and mature the moral sensibilities. It not so much to

cram the mind with intellectual food, as it is to exercise its energies upon the great questions of study and knowledge, and by its own strivings and efforts to develop its utmost capacities and work out its own conclusions. We cannot, therefore, withhold our most earnest protest against the implied assumption, that the true aim and best results of this ancient and noble science, are merely to communicate knowledge, however valuable and necessary this may be, and that he has attained the best education who may boast the possession of the largest variety and heaviest burden of remembered facts. In a word, it is not memory, but mind, with which education is mainly concerned. To know, to recite, to repeat, to state what others have done, is comparatively easy and of as little value, whilst to think, to reason, to bring forth the results of reflection and study, demands a sterner application, and, by strengthening the whole mental economy, bestows a vastly richer reward.

It is needful also to observe a proper distinction between education and native force of mind. Genius is not hostile to study, to intense and prolonged application, nor unmindful of the advangtage and great desirableness of the most complete discipline, but neither is it indispensable. The former may be had even (and of necessity most frequently) without the latter. There are more men of education, than of distinguished natural talent, and they, the sons of toil, have accomplished the most lasting and abiding results. It were well if all men of education were, at the same time, men of genius, not only of respectable, but of commanding native force of mind, though no one can so easily dispense with the advantages thereof, or so readily supply its absence, as he who has strengthened and sharpened and regulated his natural powers by the discipline of the schools. Education is, in no sense, hostile to genius, nor envious of its magic power. It is ever willing to acknowledge the brightness of that light, which her flashing torch has cast upon many a path to knowledge and truth, and, with due appreciation, to listen to the entrancing music of her angel voice, and, with admiration bordering on idolatry, to gaze upon the monuments which, in

all ages, have sprung into being at her imperial command. But dazzling and attractive as this vision may be, and desirable and valuable as its realization undoubtedly ever has been, there remains, nevertheless, the stern fact, genius is not education, talent is not learning, intellectual power is not mental discipline. However these may harmonize and mutually sustain and benefit each other, we dare not confound them in our views of education.

The culture which education affords, differs widely from that secured by the sterner discipline of life. The latter is not, however, to be undervalued or denied. It has many and great advantages, which, combined with natural vigor of intellect, have often given the victory to the self-educated over his more knowing, but less practical competitor. Reared, ofttimes, in the school of adversity, there is opportunity and necessity for an enlarged observation of men and principles, securing a closer and more philosophical estimate of their true character and real workings. In manfully breasting the surging billows which threaten to engulf the daring voyager, there are developed an energy of will and a power of endurance, such as quiet study and mere school laws can never supply, and the absence of which, leaves so many of those trained in the schools so helpless and unsuccessful. But valuable as such stern tuition may be, it cannot be substituted for the culture of the schools, nor can its subjects be regarded as educated men. In looking at the energy and perseverance, so ofter displayed by the less favored aspirant for literary excellence, we cannot but wish that a more propitious such had shone upon them. Their success would have been immeasurably greater. Might not even the myriad-minded Shakspeare have left us a still brighter legacy in the improvement of his works, as a disciplined scholar, without diminishing their inimitable naturalness and poetic fire? Surely neither Milton, nor Goethe, has lost anything by scholarship. It cannot be told to what distinguished eminence our own calm, philosophic Franklin would have attained, had he enjoyed the life-long advantages that marked the patriarchal career of Humbolt?

In endeavoring to draw the portraiture of an educated man, we dare not be content with the delineation of one who has limited his investigations to any particular profession. A very high position may be attained by observation and application in a special department, without the culture and discipline (and the many advantages which these confer) of ripe scholarship. Eminence and skill, and marked success, have often been displayed by physicians and surgeons, and lawyers and clergymen, and men of science, who have not enjoyed a preparatory, collegiate training, nor claimed an education beyond their own chosen profession.

True scholarship embraces more than an accumulation of facts upon the many subjects embraced in literature and science. A memoriter knowledge of the contents of the complete course of text-books of the schools, may excite the the admiration of the unlearned, without bestowing the finish and power of an education. The mind that has been long and thoroughly disciplined, acquires the ability of classifying and arranging the facts and principles of science and knowledge, so as to be at command when needed; reaches an accuracy and quickness of intellectual perception, which secures against deception and successfully exposes any attempted imposition or fraud; confers the power of using all that has been gathered, from a thousand sources, in the elucidation of the subject under discussion, in propounding that which may be new, or defending that which may be old. In the exercise and display of this coveted power, there must needs be the consciousness of its possession, leading, not to a vain ostentation of learning, but more likely and more naturally, to a modest and dignified bearing, to that ease and composure of manner which a well-grounded self-reliance and unavoidable self-respect inevitably create and maintain.

The popular dread of profound scholarship, as calculated to foster a haughty spirit and a disdainful view of the ordinary pursuits of life, is founded more on misconception and ignorance, than on fact. The true scholar may not have mingled sufficiently with the artful, the crafty, the selfish, and the cunning, to be able, at a glance, to comprehend their designs

and purposes, but he is not a novice in the interpretation of human character, and of men of honesty and integrity he is not ignorant. Equally mistaken is the too common judgment, that a thorough and complete education disqualifies for practical usefulness and daily toil. Mental, as well as moral qualifications, inhere not in the training, but in the person trained, and these modified, counteracted, resisted or strengthened, as they may be by the influences under which an education may be pursued, will nevertheless reappear in every situation of life, and mark the individuality of their possessor. The absence of practical tact and ready adaptation to the varying circumstances of an eventful life, are found as well among the ignorant as among the learned. The want of thrift and of the numberless comforts and conveniences of life, are not confined to the haunts and the homes of emaciated students. Study and knowledge will not, indeed, add to the talent of any one, but it will mightily quicken and direct that possessed, and aid in accomplishing the grandest results for which we are competent.

Such being the character contemplated, to what may it be devoted? What, in other words, are the aims and results of education?

The possession of any gift or talent, involves obligation. Heavy indeed, then, is the burden under which those rest to whom is entrusted the power for good or for evil which lies in a trained intellect. It is man's highest attainment. Its influences are circumscribed neither by time nor country. Its use can only be legitimate when made subservient to the honor of its divine Giver, and promotive of the good of mankind. More credit and distinction will flow from the manner in which so sacred a trust is used, than from the mere possession of it. In nothing should we so study the example of our blessed Lord, as in determining the purpose of our lives, and the grand objects to which we consecrate our powers. To do good is the only true end of our being, and to do good is the highest aim, the only proper use, of educated mind.

The man of thorough culture, should not be a man of selfish impulses. The ignorant and uneducated may be pitied for the narrowness of their sympathies and the selfishness of their feelings, but the more favored sons of study and discipline, merit severest condemnation when personal enjoyment limits their desires or efforts. Gifts and opportunities are bestowed for use, for the good of others. We may not neglect them, nor bury them. Money is not the only thing over which men are miserly. To withhold the beauty and delight which fill the soul of the thoughtful and the gifted, is to be traitor to the trust confided to us. All nature is generous, reflecting the image of its Maker, refreshing the spirit and rejoicing the soul of every beholder. Let every scholar imitate.

We dare not denounce the desire for reputation, for personal fame, without some qualification. It may become excessive and offensive, but may mingle very properly with other less selfish motives. When to acquire the good opinion of others, we strive to do them good, to impart the lessons we have received, we use aright our treasures of truth and knowledge. When simply to gain their applause, we prostitute our powers to ignoble ends, to defend vice or decry virtue, we degrade ourselves and debase our learning. Pensonal considerations cannot be entirely excluded, but should not be paramount or controlling.

The attainment of fortune is another, though oft necessary, yet an inferior, end of education. Very few, indeed, are born to hereditary ease and affluence, so as to be exempt from all care or concern for a livelihood or for the maintenance of a family. With such the work of life is the battle for bread, and whatever may be the department of labor entered, it must yield the supply for daily wants and for the necessities of old age. Whilst temporal necessity and personal comforts cannot be entirely ignored, they form but a secondary consideration in the aims and results of those prosecuting a course of liberal study.

There are other purposes to which educated intellect has been directed, of a totally unworthy and purely ignoble char-

acter, which are so manifestly a perversion and a prostitution that, whilst we weep to remember that

> "Ev'n the light which led astray,
> Was light from Heaven,"

we feel no obligation to follow it into the sties of profligacy, and kennels of impurity, and haunts of dishonesty, and halls of infidelity, and resorts of low wit and coarse profanity, to which it leads. Because the power and resources of the vile and of the dishonest, are multiplied and intensified by the advantages of culture, we admit not for a moment, that these tendencies to evil inhere, in any manner or to any degree, to education as such, but present as the true solution of the enigma, the very manifest fact that vice and iniquity will press into their service every controllable assistant, and the greater its power, the more eagerly will its aid be sought. If cultivated intellect be feared, because it thus becomes capable of prodigies of evil, whence shall we look for a counteractive and corrective energy, but to the results of that same culture, lifted up by virtue and honor and faith to that loftier sphere, in which the true purposes of education are found. Ignorance, however upright in its intentions, is no competent match for educated villainy. In self-defence, we must meet Greek with Greek.

From this rather negative aspect of the aims and results of intellectual training, we would indicate more positively our view of the highest and noblest uses and purposes to which it may be applied.

In its reference to the individual scholar, and as it affects its own subjects, the highest purpose of education is *the perfecting of our manhood.*

Man is born an infant not only as to his body, but as to his mind and soul. For the growth and sustenance of these, peculiar conditions are necessary. There must be food and exercise for the powers of the body, to secure the purposes of their creation. So of the mind; there must be intellectual nourishment and mental exercise to attain the end designed. As of the delicate, infant body no just estimate can be form-

ed of the degree of strength and endurance and effort, of which it may in after years become capable, so, too, of the mind and soul, no imagination can reach the limit of their capacities. It were sad, by neglect, or violence, or abuse, to arrest the natural and healthy growth of the physical stature, and prevent the realization of man's highest development, for there is truth, as well as poetry, in the Psalmist's line, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." We cannot but look with feelings of sadness and pity and regret upon any who, by accident or disease, have been dwarfed in their stature, or arrested in their growth. On the other hand, we congratulate those who, under favoring circumstances, have attained, beyond their associates, the perfection of physical manhood. We study the laws of health, and write out rules for eating and drinking, for sleeping and waking, for exercise and rest, and we canonize the men who warn us of danger or cure us of disease. And it is well. Such a wondrous machine is designed for a noble end, and is capable of marvellous uses. The attainment of the true end of its creation, is not the adornment of it in fair clothing or fine linen, a walking advertisement for the village tailor, but the calling forth, and directing and sustaining, of its inherent energies and capabilities, for life's purposes.

Thus, too, of the intellect, that higher nature in man. Its power is imperial, its dominion absolute. Care and skill may quicken its daily activity, direct and control its early manifestations, and by presenting the true objects for its examination and study, may fit for further and more difficult effort. We cannot limit its capacity. The attainment of one height only qualifies for another and more daring flight. The successful removal of one difficulty, instead of exhausting its resources, only sharpens them for further and more dreaded conflict. The true and highest purpose of education, consists more in the culture and consequent progress of the student, than in the accomplishment of any given result. Even though the particular lesson or exercise be forgotten, there remains an awakened and strengthened activity of mind, an increased and more serviceable self-reliance and a control of

the changeable states of mind and feeling, beyond all price to the student. The particular objects we pursue, are but the copy line by which we are to practice, until we have learned to write with ease and elegance. It matters little of what words or sentences composed, the end is improvement, progress. Success in the attainment of any particular object of study accomplishes this additional result of self-improvement and mental discipline.

It is just here that the cry for a radical change iu the curriculum of collegiate study is at fault. The practical and utilitarian tendency of the day, loses sight of the value and necessity of linguistic, mathematical and philosophical pursuits for the full and complete exercise of thought and reason, and, looking upon education as a mere cramming process, it fails to secure the ability successfully to use the stores of information imparted. Even David found the armor of Saul a hindrance rather than a help. A shepherd's sling, with skill and practice to use it, served him a better purpose than the untried equipments of the king. We are not prepared to assail existing arrangements until a better process for mental discipline and intellectual development is devised than that which has the advantage of long use and almost universal approval. We plead for a full course of study, more for the exercise of mind thereby secured, than for the empty renown ot being learned.

The possession of mind imposes the inevitable obligation to elevate it to its highests position, and to develop it to its fullest capacity. Nothing more truly grand or blessed can be attempted, and nothing so ennobles and dignifies the office of a teacher, as the fact that he has immortal and imperishable mind upon which to work. The builder of wood, or stone, or marble, however skilfully his work may be done, works only for the present, or the near future. Accident may, and time must ere long, destroy his grandest achievements, but mind is indestructible. The impressions stamped upon it, will run through the ages. You cannot erase it, you cannot conceal it, there it is forever. Neither Egyptian Pyramid, nor Assyrian monument, can outlast the work of

education. Can there be anything higher, anything better, than to bring forth the united, unseen power of man's inner life, and by suited exercise and direction, so to strengthen and develop it as to carry him onward and forward towards perfection.

But as man is a trinity, born in the image and after the likeness of his Maker, that view of education is partial and incomplete, which does not embrace his spiritual as well as his intellectual nature. Defect in any one of the organs or members of the body, disqualifies for fullest effort, and mars seriously, when viewed as a whole. Weakness in either of the operations of the mind, impairs its efficiency in all its attempts, and casts its dark shadow over all its workings. Can man, then, be regarded as educated when his highest, grandest, noblest nature has received no due culture? The highest achievement can then only be acknowledged as attained when soul, mind and body have been harmoniously developed and each brought into vigorous action, and into full subjection to the law of its being, growing, strengthening, and ever reaching forth toward some unattained end. There must be work for the body, thought for the mind, and faith for the soul, and then shall we see the grandest, divinest sight earth can present us, man, erect, in the image of his Maker, reading the laws of the universe, using the forces of nature for his daily benefit, and in constant communion with the Father of his spirit. Man's physical powers need the guidance of mind to lift them above the sphere of mere brute force; man's mind needs the inspiration of his soul, to lift his thought on high and make his work divine.

The aims and results of education, terminate not with the the individual educated, but reach to the utmost confines of society. A great truth, a grand discovery, an important invention, like the towering palace and costly structure of the prince, is for the eyes of every beholder. Columbus, indeed, first practically solved the question of a western hemisphere, but at once the tidings were proclaimed to an astonished world. The work of the Reformers ended not with their own deliverance from error and superstition and sacerdotal

enslavement, but it has ever since been felt, in increasing force, throughout Christendom, liberating mind, purifying society, and elevating all the great social and intellectual interests of our race. The author, the orator, the devotee of science, cannot secure their own cherished and coveted aims but as they extend to others the benefit of their powers.

The invention of the art of printing, of the safety-lamp, of the sewing machine, of telegraphic communication, of the application of steam to machinery and the like, has not only given immortality to a name, but a much richer blessing to grateful millions. Guiding the growing intellect of a nation, is vastly more important and far-reaching in results, than drilling armies or directing campaigns. The imperious commander controls only the physical man, the imperial educator moulds the mind. In a word, the interests of literature, of morals, of society, of science and of art, are confided to the educating and the educated. It is theirs to receive the charge, and to improve the trust, and by constant effort to lighten toil, to discipline mind, to correct morals, and to strengthen faith, may they show that among the aims and purposes of education are the elevation of society and the improvement of our race.

The national aspect in which this whole question might be presented, invests it with still additional interest and importance. The elevation of our nation, the honor of our name, the influence of our government among the families of earth, the perpetuity of our free institutions, and the longevity of our national fabric, are dear to every patriot. And are not these bound up with the question of education, of our schools and colleges and universities? No arithmetic can estimate, or language depict, the mighty waves of influence ever going forth from the ancient and modern universities of Europe. What has given to Great Britain and to Germany such preponderance in the scale of nations, but their noble, their almost omnipotent, institutions of learning? And let but the cultivation of our American national mind keep pace with our unparalleled growth in every other direction (the disproportion is daily decreasing), and we shall yet stand, in litera-

ture, in science and art, where we now stand in all other respects, in the front rank of the nations of the earth.

It becomes us, then, as a Church, as a Christian denomination, to enlarge the foundations and greatly to increase the advantages of our literary and theological schools. We have no lack in point of numbers, but how few possess full and adequate facilities. How little has been given to render pleasant and attractive our halls of science and seats of learning. The plastic, youthful mind should be surrounded by healthful influences, elevating and refining to the taste and sensibilities, whilst prosecuting a course of study. Works of art and skill, should adorn the grounds, whilst well-filled libraries and well-stocked laboratories should fill the rooms of our institutions. Above all should the number of earnest, sympathizing, faithful and competent instructors be increased, and their daily toil and mental drudgery be relieved by fewer recitations, and much larger salaries.

Men of wealth and philanthropy could make no better investment of their abundant means, than by adding largely to the endowment of colleges and theological seminaries, and then, by seeking out needy, but ambitious and deserving young men, place them in the enjoyment of the advantages they have thus provided. The benediction of thousands unborn will rest upon the hand that opens for them the portals of the temple of knowledge and truth.

ARTICLE V.

THE PULPIT.*

By Rev. Thomas Guthrie, Edinburgh, Scotland.

In our earliest prospectus we ventured to express a hope that the Sunday Magazine would provide interesting and profitable reading, on the Lord's day, for all classes. To sat-

* Reprinted from the May number of the *Sunday Magazine,* American Edition, J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

isfy all men was what we never hoped for: nor do we mean to say that we ourselves are not conscious of having in any instance fallen short of the mark, but are ready, in the words of the Liturgy, to acknowledge that "we have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done." A sense of this makes us all the more thankful for the large circulation and great favor we have obtained at home, as well also throughout our colonies and in the United States; and few things give us more pleasure than to know that our readers embrace a large number of persons engaged in the work of the Christian ministry, or preparing for it. In these days of "blasphemy and rebuke," of loose opinions and loose practice, may all of them be fully equipped for their sacred office, and prove themselves, in the sphere both of pastoral and pulpit duties, "workmen that need not to be ashamed!"

We have no sympathy with such as talk of things being "dull as a sermon;" nor do we believe in the newspaper slang of the day that "the pulpit has lost its power." With many who talk so we suspect that "the wish is father to the thought." At the same time, we think that the pulpit is held in too low an estimate as well by some of the friends as of the foes of religion; and that those who have the charge of training up preachers of the Gospel, while storing their minds with knowledge, are not sufficiently alive to the importance of teaching them how to use it. How much more carefully, as may be seen in any drill-ground, are soldiers trained to fight than candidates for the ministry are trained to preach! Yet no man who has, what every man ought to have, a high aim finds it an easy thing to preach—Robert Hall himself having said, not long before his death, "I have been trying all my life long to preach well, and have never yet succeeded."

It has occurred to us that it might be of advantage to some engaged in the duties of the ministry, or preparing for them, to read the following letter. It is written by one who has had a pretty large pulpit experience, and in answer to an

application which reached him from the students of a theological seminary in the United States:—

23rd February, 1871.

Dear Sir,—The subject on which you wish me to set down my views is one which, to do it justice, would require both much time and thought. My avocations leave me little of either. Yet rather than decline your request, and seem indifferent to anything which may concern the religious interests of a country whose greatness I admire, in whose prosperity I rejoice, and to whose people I feel bound by the intimate and sacred ties of a common faith, and a common tongue, and common blood, I will note down some few things, belonging to the work of the pulpit, very much as they rise to my mind.

As an ambassador for Christ—to use the words of St. Paul—who, praying sinners in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, is charged with a mission of eternal importance, I regard a preacher of the Gospel as filling the most responsible office any mortal can occupy. His pulpit is in my eyes loftier than a throne; and of all professions, learned or unlearned, his, though usually in point of wealth the poorest, I esteem the most honorable. The ministry, as Matthew Henry well remarks, is the worst of trades, but the best of professions. That office is one angels themselves might covet.

These being my views, you will not be surprised that I deem it impossible for a preacher to feel too anxious or be too laborious in preparing for the pulpit. Unlike such as take the work easy, and content themselves with going through it in a perfunctory manner, Paul was among the Corinthians, as he tells us, "in fear and in much trembling." In those beautiful lectures which Sir Joshua Reynolds has left us on the Art of Painting, he remarks that God does not give success to man but as the reward of labor—an observation, we would do well to remember, that applies as much to preaching as to painting. We have that truth applied to the ministry, and expressed in a very striking manner, by the great Adam Clarke. In reply to a young man who sought counsel of him as to how he should prepare his sermons, Clarke gave this

memorable answer, Study yourself dead and pray yourself alive again!

The oil used in the sanctuary was beaten oil. The plates of the Temple were highly refined, of "much fine gold;" and no man more than the preacher should remember that God is not only to be served, but served with the very best at our command. All men may not succeed who attempt to be great preachers; but every man should certainly try to be so. In this as in every other noble field, it is better to fail in the attempt than not to make it. Nor indeed do people know their powers till they try them; and any way, though they may never rival Apollos, him who was "eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures," none shall labor in vain, who, with prayers for a blessing from on High, do their very utmost—like her of whom the Master said, "She hath done what she could."

Is it found that some who do their utmost have not the gifts necessary for the pulpit? "Once a priest always a priest" being a mere Roman Catholic adage, there is nothing binding a man for life to this sacred, any more than to any secular, profession, if he finds himself unable to discharge its duties. The dog that *cannot*, as much as that which *will* not, bark is no fit guardian of the flock. It were well indeed that incapable men were stopped in time, but better late than never. The interests at stake are great; the ministry is a field where souls are lost or won; and therefore the pulpit is of all places that which can least afford to be filled with "cumberers of the ground." In making statements like these at a dinner-table where a bishop was present, I was met by one appealing to him, how that could be, seeing that every candidate for holy orders, in seeking them, declared himself to be moved by the Holy Ghost? An objection to the bill brought into the House of Lords for allowing clergymen of the English Church to demit their office and loose themselves of their ordination vows, which I met with a sufficient answer—this, namely, that such candidates must have been mistaken, since God never calls a man by his Spirit to any office for which he is not fit. If that be so, it is right, honorable to themselves and loyal to Christ and his cause, for incompetent

persons to abandon the pulpit; however good and devout men they may be, when it is proved that God has not bestowed on them the requisite qualifications, to continue there is not to follow Providence, but to fly in the face of it.

But with whatever powers of popular address preachers are endowed, be assured that they will not do justice to the pulpit without a proper estimate of its importance as a mighty instrument for good, and the means God has honored above all others to convert sinners and edify the body of believers. It is told of David Wilkie, the great painter, that in a sense he carried canvas, palette, and brushes with him wherever he went; noting everything his eye fell on that might be introduced with effect into the picture on his easel—till he got home putting it down on his thumb-nail, if he happened to see it in the street or in company. He was an enthusiast in his profession; and so should every preacher be. What painting was to Wilkie, preaching should be to him—his preparation for it a holy passion, and so absorbing as to occupy much of his thoughts "in the house and by the way," throughout the whole running week. So it was with one of the greatest preachers, not excepting Jeremy Taylor or Robert Hall, England has ever produced. Such fragments of his sermons as I have seen make one regret that no proper record of them has been preserved, now that the dust of death lies on his lips. He belonged to the Congregational body. A small farmer in Wales, or its neighborhood, he was found day by day working in his fields. These, the hill-sides where he tended his little flock, the grassy bank where he sat of a summer evening, talking about the things of this world and the next with the simple peasants of the neighborhood, were his study. Every day, and during all its hours, he was gathering from the face of nature and the various aspects of society, from the memories of his Bible and the depths of his own heart, materials for his sermon; and with these, all fused and glowing in the fires of piety and genius, this man, who had never seen a college, held in rapt attention the vast crowd of all ranks and classes which he drew, Sunday by Sunday, from far and near. He certainly did not, and no

preacher should, expose himself to the censure one of his parishioners pronounced on a clergyman who shone at assemblies—for dancing; was a famous fisher—of trouts; and was oftener seen in the hunting-field than in his study. "Our minister," said the man, "makes a by-job of our souls." And what else do they make both of souls and sermons who huddle their preparation for the pulpit into the last day, or days, of the week? When we think for whom the preacher speaks, to whom he speaks, and what everlasting issues may hang upon his lips, how *that* can satisfy his conscience passes my understanding. And here I may relate how well and wittily one of this easy-going class was rebuked by a friend. Both were known to me, and both, like myself, were fond of fishing. On meeting at the breakfast-table on a fine summer's morning, the one, a boaster, though an able man, said to the other, "I have done to-day already what passes your powers—written a sermon, and killed a salmon!" A brag to which his friend made this happy retort—"It may be so; but I'd rather eat the salmon than hear the sermon!"

In regard to the theme and character of his discourses, let the motto of every preacher be St. Paul's, as expressed in his famous saying, "I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified!" And here I cannot help saying, if this central truth, with all the doctrines that revolve around, and all the duties that spring from it, be fully set forth, with God's blessing, the results will justify Cowper's beautiful exclamation—

> "Thou bleeding Lamb,
> The best morality is love of Thee."

Jesus Christ the grand theme of the preacher, as He was of the prophets and apostles, let the preacher prove, paint, and persuade—have the three "p's," as they have been called, in every sermon. By the use of these, according to the topic in their proper proportions, he embraces the whole constitution of man—by arguments addressing the reason, by figures the imagination, and by appeals the heart with its affections. Let him also, like a man in earnest, employ clear and simple

language. No man who is drowning calls for a rope, no officer charging a battery addresses his men, in learned and pompous terms; and a minister seeking to save souls, or lead God's people in the good fight of faith, should aim at plainness, directness, perspicuity—like Mr. Spurgeon, for example. Say no odd things; but try so to put the ordinary but saving truths of the Gospel that, to use vulgar and yet expressive terms, they may both *strike* and *stick*. It is much easier to be obscure and involved than simple; a truth well expressed in the answer of an eminent divine to one who, disappointed with his preaching, said, "I expected to hear from such a learned man as you something else than a discourse marked by great simplicity." "Ah," replied the other, "it needs all my learning to be simple!" Pertinent to this I may tell you an anecdote. In criticising the sermon of a student in divinity, which looked profound but was only obscure, the professor said that it reminded him of the way a countryman took to calm his mother when, to her great terror she saw him, then a schoolboy, wading the water with which a river, overflowing its banks, had flooded all the fields, "It's no deep, mem," he cried, "its only *drumlie*,"—that is (Anglice), thick, turbid. In the composition of a discourse, beauty, clearness, and depths are properties which may be all combined, and should all be aimed at—each and every sermon, like the Rhone where it darts impetuous on its way beneath the bridge of Geneva, deep, in color blue and beautiful as the cloudless azure, and withal so translucent that you see down into its bed as if air, not water, were the medium you looked through.

So much for the Matter, now as to the manner, which, let me say, deserves much more attention than it commonly receives. True of other professions, it is no less, I had almost said it is still more, true of the preacher's, that the manner is half the battle. How vexed have I sometimes been to see a noble discourse spoiled by bad taste, vigorous and stirring thoughts fall flat on an audience through the feebleness, of the speaker's manner! It is, in fact, if I may employ such an illustration, very much with preaching a sermon as with

firing a gun—the manner is the powder, the matter is the shot: and it is well known that a tallow-candle with a sufficient quantity of powder will go through a deal-board, that a leaden bullet would not pierce fired off with a feeble charge. Yet, though a bad manner of speech and action is sufficient to blunt the edge of a superior sermon, while a good manner will make an inferior one tell with effect upon an audience, many preachers seem to think this point below their notice. So thought not Demosthenes, nor Cicero, nor any of the celebrated orators of antiquity. Nor so thought George Whitefield, who cultivated his voice with such care that it was said he could make men weep or laugh by the way he pronounced the word Mesopotamia. No doubt he was more than most men "to the manner born:" but we can as little doubt that those charms of voice and action by which he moved vast congregations, as a field of corn is swayed by the wind, were due to great care and labor. One witness states that he heard Whitefield preach his celebrated sermon on the Crucifixion fifteen times; so often that he at length knew by anticipation each tone and gesture; and yet, reminding us of the saying, "A thing of beauty is a joy forever," he enjoyed it as much the fifteenth time as he did the first. A wonderful example *that* of the perfection of manner and voice which few indeed reach, but all should aim at; and will with conscience and care, to a greater or less extent, attain. It is told of Garrick that on one occasion he sat with rapt admiration hearing Whitefield; and how at a part of the discourse where the great preacher laid his handkerchief on the Bible, or raised it to his eyes, he turned to a fellow-player beside him, and whispered, "I'd give all the money of a benefit-night, could I handle my handkerchief as that fellow does!" "That fellow," was honored of God to draw greater crowds and save more souls than any man of his day; and surely those pulpit aids which he set such store on are neither to be neglected nor lightly esteemed.

According to Mark, Jesus, addressing the multitude on one occasion, said, Take heed *what* ye hear: according to St. Luke, he said, Take heed *how* ye hear; and to me the man-

ner, as well as the matter, appears so important that I would employ both terms in giving advice to preachers, saying, Take heed *what* ye speak, and take heed also *how* ye speak—so cultivate your voice as, with your action, to suit its intonation to the word; acquire such grace of manner as is seen in the movements of little children; throw off all constrained and awkward habits, either of speech, or look, or action; in one word, be *natural.* The triumph and charm of all oratory, in the pulpit or anywhere else, *that* I admit is difficult—we are much the creatures of habit; and is impossible, unless care be taken not to sin against nature, either by imitation or by affectation. As to the first, we should study fine models, but not closely copy them. Nothing is gained by a slavish imitation. On the contrary, our inferiority to the great model we ape is only made the more conspicuous by the tones and actions which recall him to the recollection of our hearers; and should they never have heard him, there is still nothing gained, but much lost, since, as God has given to every man his own manner, another man's will sit as awkwardly on us as his clothes would do. As to affectation, pomposity of speech, and such other faults, I have heard an advice of John Kemble's worth relating. A gentleman with a long, grave countenance, dressed like a minister and armed with a Bible, was one day ushered into his parlor, somewhat to Kemble's alarm. Whether it was, or was not, because "conscience makes cowards of us all," now, thought the player, I am in for a rebuke! But what was his relief when his visitor, walking up in a stiff and stately manner, accosted him thus, Forgive the liberty, Mr. Kemble, but I have taken the opportunity of your being in town to know how you would read such and such a passage of Scripture! Suppressing a smile, and seeing at a glance whom he had to deal with, Kemble, while politely professing his readiness to assist, suggested that the divine himself should read the passage first. And this he did *ore rotundo*, in a pedantic and pompous style. Thereupon the great tragedian cut short the conference, bowing the doctor out with this brief but invaluable lesson, Allow me, sir, to advise you when you read the Scriptures, or

any other book, to think more of what you read than how you read! Perhaps there is no fault of speech or manner to be so much avoided as affectation; nor any place where it is more offensive than in the pulpit. As the poet says:—

> "In man or woman, but far most in man,
> And most of all in man that ministers,
> And serves the altar, in my soul I loathe
> All affectation. 'Tis my perfect scorn;
> Object of my implacable disgust.
> What!—will a man play tricks, will he indulge
> A silly fond conceit of his fair form
> And just proportion, fashionable mien
> And pretty face, in presence of his God?
> Or will he seek to dazzle me with tropes,
> As with the diamond on his lily hand,
> And play his brilliant parts before my eyes
> When I am hungry for the bread of life?
> He mocks his Maker, prostitutes and shames
> His noble office, and, instead of truth,
> Displaying his own beauty, starves his flock.
> Therefore avaunt all attitude, and stare,
> And start theatric, practiced at the glass!
> I seek divine simplicity in him,
> Who handles things divine."

One other fault—and here I pray, respected brethren, to bear with me—I must refer to, as materially detracting from the legitimate influence of the pulpit. It is a very common one; not on that account, however, to be the less, but the more condemned. I mean the practice of reading sermons; one which, I fancy, had its origin in the early days of the Reformation, when many of those who filled the pulpits of England—Roman Catholic priests who had veered round with the Court—being unable, or unwilling, to preach gospel-truth, were required to read on Sundays the Homilies of the Church. Whatever be its origin, the custom, I am told, is all but universal in America; is so in the Church of England; and, though long opposed by the *dour* and determined Presbyterians of Scotland, has even there crept into common use. The latter circumstance is probably in large measure

due to the fact that the greatest of Scotch pulpit orators was a reader. An example not to have been followed by ordinary mortals! as was well expressed by a shrewd Scotch woman in reply to one who defended reading, and cast Dr. Chalmers' practice in the other's face. To the challenge, Did not Dr. Chalmers read his sermons? True, she replied, but Chalmers was a *fell* reader: in other words—if I understand the language aright—one who read with extraordinary power. He read in fact, as all will testify who have heard him, with such vehemence, enthusiasm, and fire, as have distinguished only the greatest orators. Not one in twenty thousand preachers can ever hope to read as Chalmers read. He swept all before him with the power of a mountain torrent.

Were the preacher's business only to instruct, to store the mind with knowledge, to give forth simple and unimpassioned statements of divine truth, we should be content, if it were clearly put, though it were coldly said; in that case the reading of a sermon in the pulpit would lie open to no valid objection. But since the heart of man has suffered even more than his head by the Fall, one great object of the preacher is to engage the affections, to turn their current heavenward, and win the heart over to God. This is the work of conversion—that divine, saving, and indispensable change, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh." But where, besides convincing the reason, the object of the speaker is to engage the affections, rouse the dormant feelings, and carry the heart as by storm, what man in his senses, in any other place than a pulpit, would read his address? Fancy Demosthenes attempting to "wield the fierce democracy" with a paper in his hand! Fancy Cicero rising in the Forum to launch his thunders at Cataline from a black portfolio! These men knew better. And why, with a task much more difficult, and involving interests infinitely more important, should preachers of the Gospel hamper themselves with papers?—some, as if ashamed of the Gospel, or conscious that, while they looked at their papers, the people were looking at

the clock, not once venturing to raise their eyes and look their hearers in the face. Was it so Paul stood on his defence before Felix—making the tyrant tremble?—was it so Peter preached when, God blessing his words, he converted thousands by a single sermon, and, a greater fisherman than ever, gathered them with one sweep of his net into the kingdom of heaven?

Fas este ab hoste doceri: and our good Protestants might learn much from the practice of Roman Catholic priests. They never read their sermons; though that were more excusable in them than in our ministers, to whom the pulpit is a familiar place. There is little of preaching—properly speaking—among the papists abroad, but during Lent. Then they do preach, and many of them, especially some of the friars, with great power. I have heard them often; and though they sometimes give a stagger, flounder for a moment, they never stick—providing against such an accident, in Italy, perhaps elsewhere also, in an odd way. Admitted into the pulpit before the congregation assembles, a boy sits squatting there. Nobody sees him from the galleries, for their churches have none. When the preacher opens his subject, the boy, who is called a *suggeritore*, opens the preacher's manuscript; ready, as a prompter, whenever the speaker's memory is like to fail him, to supply the word. A clever device, which might perhaps, where needed, be adopted at home. Any way, it shows the importance which Rome, very shrewd in many things, attaches to spoken as against read sermons.

Fancy reading practiced elsewhere than in the church, carried into the common affairs of life, and nothing else is needed to expose its absurdity. Let me illustrate this; pleading the force of the illustration in excuse of its familiarity. A man, for example, falls in love with a woman; he wishes to win her affections; and prepared to make her an offer of his hand and heart, he solicits an interview. They meet—how soon to part! Imagine the lady's astonishment when, instead of approaching with ardor in his looks, he coolly enters, pulls a manuscript from his pocket and with it a pair of spectacles,

and after adjusting them on his nose, begins, in a voice as hard as iron and cold as ice, to read an oration! How soon in any woman of sense, or of spirit, would indignation take the place of astonishment, and summon a servant to show the pedant to the door? Or look at men in other circumstances of life—at the bar, on the hustings, in the senate. When they would rouse the feelings, or carry conviction to the minds of others, do they not stand before them eye to eye, and face to face?—the barrister who rises to address a jury, knowing right well that, if he reads his speech, it is ten to one but he will lose his cause. He who would make others weep must himself weep, says the old poet; and he who would speak to other men's hearts must speak, or appear at least to speak, from his own.

Here I have all antiquity on my side; and all the preachers of Christendom also, save those that speak the English tongue. It was not from papers that Luther thundered, and Calvin reasoned—shaking the walls of Rome. It was on other pinions that Bossuet and Masillon soared aloft. Nor, to come to modern times, have I ever heard a sermon read in any church, Protestant or Roman Catholic, on all the continent of Europe; neither in Holland, nor in Belgium, nor in Germany, nor in France, nor in Switzerland, nor in Italy. In Italy, as I have listened to a preaching-friar standing before his audience whom he held entranced, a consummate master of sacred oratory, how I have wished that our preachers of truth would make more use of the weapons he was employing with such signal effect in the cause and on the side of error! And why not? With some practice, and going about the thing in the right way, if the discourse is suited to a popular assembly, it is much easier to fix it in the mind than many, till they try it, would imagine. Nor, if a man has that self-possession which is acquired in time by familiarity with the pulpit, need he fear losing the thread of his discourse. Let him only, as was my habit, pin a slip of paper to the leaves of the open Bible: there let the heads and chief topics of the sermon—each in their proper order, and marked in many cases only by a leading word—be so legibly set down

as to be caught by a glance of the eye; and the preacher cannot be thrown off the rails. But though the difficulties of dispensing with the paper were as formidable as many imagine, should preachers of the Gospel, who ought to be an example of self-denial, shrink from the cross; grudge any labor that may help them to save those for whom the Son of God himself labored, and lived, and died?

Before leaving this topic, allow me to say that, unless in those passages where the impression depended much on, as a good style has been defined, "right words in right places," I never made myself the slave of memory, repeating the discourse *verbatim*, exactly as it was written. On the contrary, new ideas were introduced, that rose unbidden, and were thrown off like sparks in the heat of delivery; and the comparatively cold expressions of the quiet study were also often exchanged for more fervid and forcible terms. However, and at the same time, the discourse was always committed to memory so carefully, that by practice it rose to the mind without any conscious effort; leaving one free to give vent to their feelings, and speak as if they were speaking from the spur of the moment. I would say commit so well, that you may never think in the pulpit what comes next. Beware, however, of committing to memory aloud, like one I knew, who thereby fell into a monotonous manner, and besides disturbing the whole house on Saturday evening, roared himself hoarse as a raven. I found another advantage from committing silently, this, namely, that the words sounded almost as fresh to my ears as to the people's, and awakening thereby my own emotions, gave naturalness, force, and fire to the delivery. But if it is bad to commit, I think it good to compose aloud in your study, as if you were in your pulpit addressing your congregation, with them all seated before you, in your mind's eye. This helps to impart vivacity to the discourse, to save it from dull, long-winded, lumbering sentences, and, without running into the merely conversational, to throw over the whole the charm of a spoken style.

So much on the matter and manner of preaching. As to the mode of composing sermons, that was an art which, on

my becoming a clergyman, notwithstanding many years passed at a celebrated university, I may say I had to learn. I knew that it was "not by might, or by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," that men were to be savingly converted, turned to Christ, and made good Christians; but this I knew to be within my power, and, by God's help, I determined it should be done—that while I preached the congregation should neither sit listless nor go to sleep. "Do you imagine," said Sydney Smith, when stirring up the lazy clergy of his archdeaconry to exert themselves, "that a soul is saved as Eve was made, by first casting the man into a deep sleep?" Certainly not. So the question with me was, how to rouse the attention of my hearers, and touch their feelings, and instruct their minds, and keep their eyes and ears open to the last sentence of the sermon.

For this purpose I turned to study the discourses of the great old prophets, and more especially the teachings of Him, the Prince of preachers, who drew all men after him, and won even from his enemies this high eulogium—"Never man spake like this man!" Now, what did I find? I found, in the first place, that they clothed their thoughts in familiar language. So, at the expense of being thought unlearned and shallow by fools, I resolved to avoid learned terms, and wherever possible use only the Saxon tongue—the language of my people's homes and hearts, of their loves and hatreds, of their joys and sorrows, of all those scenes in life where Nature rises to assert her supremacy. I observed also that the prophets and our divine Master employed figures and illustrations to a large extent, thereby throwing a flood of light on the subject; and, while instructing the mind, pleasing the fancy and moving the heart. In this, at however great a distance, I resolved to follow them, and take advantage of the principle in our nature so well expressed by the humble woman who, referring to our Lord's parables and other such parts of Scripture, said, The *likes* are the parts of the Bible that I like best!

As you seek counsel, and I very much feel myself like an old soldier called, after his campaigns are over, to address a

body of recruits, I may tell you, though it goes against the grain to be talking of myself, somewhat of my practice. Let us open the study door! After fixing on a text, it was my custom to put down on paper, just as they occurred, all thoughts, sentiments, figures, and illustrations that seemed pertinent to the subject in hand; very much as a man who has a house to build, tumbles down in rude heaps on the ground wood, stone, lime, slates, and other materials. Nor was it till I had thus provided a store of matter, and brought some order out of this chaos by arranging all under appropriate heads, that I proceeded to the proper work of composition; leaving always a blank page opposite to the one written on, for such additions and alterations as a careful revision might suggest. On this revision hours were spent, erasing all repetitions, aiming at more logical and lucid arrangements, making obscure expressions clear, toning up the weak parts, and making every description of actors and scenes as graphic as possible. See to it, however, in the first instance, that your discourse is composed of solid matter; it being with sermons as with woods, stones, and metals, the more solid the substance the higher the polish it takes on.

In all these preparations, I frankly confess I experienced "the pains of labor;" for though the preaching of the sermon usually afforded me much pleasure, I never or seldom had any in its composition. In that work, I may remark, I derived advantages from committing the discourse to memory, which more than reconciled me to the trouble such a practice imposes on all who, like myself, have not a good verbal memory. To explain this let me mention an anecdote related by Dean Ramsay in his entertaining "Scotch Reminiscences." "How is it," said a Scotchman, who had all the aversion of his country to the sight of a paper in the pulpit—"how is it, sir," said he, addressing his minister, "that you read, instead of preaching, your sermons?" "Well, John," was the answer, "I read them because I cannot remember them." Whereupon John shrewdly retorted: "And, sir, if ye that *mak* them canna mind them, how do you think we can?" A question that which it would take a clever man to

answer! The principle it embodies I knew and held before the Dean's book was born; and carrying it out, it was my practice to condemn every passage in the discourse, even those I thought the best, which it required an extraordinary effort to commit to memory. I drew the pen through it—rueful, probably, but ruthless—reasoning thus: if it does not make such an impression on my own mind as to be remembered without much difficulty, how is it to impress others? If, however, my unfortunate offspring embodied some really important truth, it was not slaughtered; but the passage was thrown into the form of a question to give it point and make it stick, or a figure, an illustration, was attached to it, by way of a buoy, to make it float.

But this was not the only test I used for trying the suitableness of my sermons. Another and perhaps a better one I found in a class of young men and women held on the Sunday evenings—very much to my instruction, whatever it might be to theirs in this way. There, among other exercises, they had to give an account of the sermon of the day: I, though they were not in the secret, making up my mind to conclude, however mortifying to one's vanity it might be, that if the more intelligent of them could not give a reasonably fair account of it, the fault lay not with them but with me; was not to be found in their memory, but sought in my sermon. Well, in applying this test, I would get, for example, a good account of the introduction, and also of the first head; a very meagre one of the second; the third was an utter blank; while the peroration perhaps, when it might be thought attention was blunted and patience exhausted, appeared to have impressed itself on their minds like a seal on wax. On returning home it was my custom to set myself to see in what features the parts of the discourse that were well, differed from those that were ill remembered; and having found out the faults of the latter, I endeavored henceforth to avoid them; and on the other hand to carefully cultivate the style of those passages which had engaged the attention and touched the feelings of my hearers. I found this often a mortifying but also a most profitable exercise; and believe—

though I set great value on classics, philosophy, and theology—that, so far as the sacred art of preaching was concerned, I owed more to the self-instruction I have described than to all the years and money that had been spent on a full University curriculum.

Receive these notes, hurriedly written and imperfect as they are, with my best wishes. I pray God to open the windows of heaven and send down a flood of blessings on you, your seminary, and your churches. With all our pains, let us never forget how needful, how indispensable for success in the ministry prayer is; that except the Lord himself build the house—bless the builders and establish the work of their hands—they labor in vain that build it. Bear in mind, I pray you, that he is best fitted to preach to men dying in their sins who is most steeped in the spirit of Jesus Christ; and he most sure of the blessing whose eyes are ever turned to the hills from whence cometh our aid.

Believe me yours sincerely and affectionately,

ARTICLE VI.

THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

By Rev. J. D. Severinghaus, A. M., Oswego, N. Y.

1. The recently established German Empire is an entirely new member of the governmental family of Europe. Its constituent parts have a history, checkered and long; but its national identity is the creature of our times. History knows of no purely German and actually united empire in Germany; the living present has not finished congratulating this new-born power, yet its establishment is considered secure beyond a peradventure.

Though, indeed, the dream of German patriots for years, the realization of German unity was considered, twelve months ago, as the wild scheme of ambitious Bismarck.

And yet we have it! A genuine, hearty, enthusiastic union of twenty-eight states in one strong government, headed by William I., as the unanimous choice of forty millions of intelligent people. Like a storm-cloud, hurriedly snatching up all the black, white and red patches that float in confused independence upon the horizon, and with them climbing, in one massive column, up to the very zenith of the firmament, sputtering hail, fire and thunder, making the earth tremble under its jarring rush, and again strewing its pathway with kindly blessings—so has Germany rushed into an awe-inspiring existence, thundering and purifying, rending and cementing, killing and making alive.

The recent "seven-months' war" has established the German empire, and enveloped it with an interest that justly challenges the attention of the world. We dare not always judge causes by the effects they produce. Here we have a terrible cause producing the most beneficent results. Short as that war was, it was costly, bloody, heart-rending and glorious. It exhibited military prowess that is as much the astonishment of the world, as the far-reaching results are important. That the Germans of every land should jubilate over the proud record which the Vaterland has made in the seven months' war, is not to be wondered at; that they should hold "peace festivals" in all our larger cities, and engage with an enthusiastic unanimity in singing

> "Nun danket alle Gott
> Mit Herzen, Mund und Händen," etc.,

is as natural and appropriate as it is for Americans to celebrate the 4th of July. Has not the Emperor of Austria, the Czar of Russia, the Queen of England, the Sultan of Turkey, the Pasha of Egypt, the President of these United States, and other rulers, all in the name of their people, congratulated the emperor William, and through him the German people, upon the German record made in the recent war?

The seven-months' war engaged two nations, single-handed, in a conflict that had been brewing for many years. More than once did Napoleon III. give occasion for it. The rela-

tion of the two nations, occupying the heart of Europe, and nearly equal in population, had to be settled upon the battle-field. Statesmanship could postpone it, but not avert it. In twenty-five wars between the two nations, footing up one hundred and seventeen years of actual war, France had been the initiator, the aggressor, and generally the winner.

On the 19th of July, 1870, King William of Prussia opened the Reichstag with a solemn address from the throne. Referring to the declaration of war by France, he said, in conclusion: "If Germany was obliged to endure such assaults upon her rights and her honor in former centuries, silently, it was because, in her divided condition, she knew not how strong she was. To-day, when the bonds of sympathy and outward union, which the wars for liberty began to cement, have become more and more intimate; to-day, when her war-preparation allows the enemy to see no breach, Germany carries in herself both the will and the ability, to resist the renewed violence of the French."

King William understood himself perfectly. He understood the magnitude of the task that French insolence had laid at his door, but he also understood the reliability of his people when German rights should have to be defended by war.

On the 4th day of July, Gen. Prim proposed Leopold, Prince of Hohenzollern, as a candidate for the Spanish throne; on the 6th Count Grammont, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, proclaimed in the legislative chambers, that France could not allow the election of a Hohenzollern to the Spanish crown, even at the risk of war with Prussia. Although Prince Leopold withdrew from the candidature on the 12th, the French ambassador, Benedetti, insisted with the King of Prussia on a guarantee that neither Leopold, nor any other Prussian should ever be permitted to become a candidate for the Spanish throne. The King, tired of this impudence, refused to see Benedetti any further upon this subject, and on the 16th of July, Grammont gave notice that France had been insulted, that her rights were abused, and

that the empire had declared war against Prussia. The formal declaration of war followed on the 19th of July.

France was fond of saying *Prussia*, instead of Germany. Napoleon and his ministers thought they could punish Prussia by its own kindred, the South-German states, as they were still suspicious and jealous of the growing influence of the Prussians. But King William received the declaration with composure, and said: "We are ready." Moltke, the Commanding General of the Confederate army, said: "If Napoleon waits until the 23d instant, he will never more get to cross the Rhine." Within thirteen days the German army stood six hundred thousand strong, between Trier and Landau, facing the Rhine. It suffered a slight defeat at Saarbrück, but did not hesitate to march, in the consciousness of its strength, into the enemy's country, flanking an outwitted army and gaining a decisive victory in a series of battles, lasting more than a week.

If we deduct from the 210 days of an actual state of war, the days of preparation and the days consumed in settling the preliminaries of peace, we have 180 days of active field work left. In these six months, the German army engaged the French, on French soil, in 180 conflicts, 17 of which were larger battles, and in nearly all these engagements, the Germans were victorious. They took 26 fortified places, captured the Emperor, his field-marshals, 11,650 officers, 363,000 prisoners of war, over 6,700 pieces of artillery, and 120 eagles and standards. The siege of Paris lasted 130 days, during which time 22 sorties were made by the besieged army, all of which were so severely handled, that Paris found itself obliged to capitulate on the 28th of January, 1871, being driven to this necessity largely by starvation. After a pretty general cessation of hostilities, the preliminaries of peace were settled between King William, at Versailles, and the French National Assembly, at Bordeaux, and agreed to on the 16th of February, which ended the war.

The treaty stipulated for an entrance of part of the German army into Paris, so that nobody might undertake to deny the German victory; for five thousand millions of francs

as a war indemnity; for a cession of Alsace and the German part of Lorraine to Germany. These countries had belonged to Germany two hundred years ago, and had been incorporated into France by fraud. Germans claimed the right to take them back again, and thought them, with their fortifications, such as Metz and Strassburg, too great a temptation for France to use them as safe gate-ways for future expeditions into Germany. When the German parliament recently ratified the articles of annexation, Bismarck said his life-work was done.

Germany is now united. The conglomeration of contending and jealous states is changed into a well-membered empire. The war that prostrated the French Empire created the Empire of Germany. On French soil the arguments for German unity were put forth. The four States, still independent at the beginning, hastened to ratify their union with the North German Confederacy as the war advanced. Bavaria could not persuade its ultramontane party to do so until the 20th of January.

As the war advanced, Prussian stock went up. The King, who ten years ago was the most unpopular monarch of Europe, became the hero of the people. Every new victory added new enthusiasm to their devotion, and it gradually became a settled matter, that he must be made "Emperor of Germany." The king of Würtemberg took the initiative in this matter, and the heads of all the states agreed to a written request, sanctioned by the parliament, that King William of Prussia should assume the title of "Emperor of Germany." He did not hesitate to accede to this request. On the 18th of January there was present in the Palace of Mirrors at Versailles, a large delegation of the rulers of Germany, as well as the Reichstag, to witness the ceremony of elevating a Hohenzollern to the proud title of German Emperor.

Such are the fortunes of war. Napoleon a prisoner and William a crowned emperor. The proud city of ancient France, where so many of her kings have been crowned, must witness a coronation that French mistakes have brought about. France strangely infatuated with the notion that the

Rhine must become her boundary line, is compelled to withdraw to the Moselle; ever and again, scheming for additional territory, she loses some of her fairest districts; trying to put down labor strikes by giving the discontented the occupation of war, she brings about national disgrace and ruin, and renders herself powerless toward the worst mob passions that were ever let loose. Whilst France is scheming to weaken Germany, by encouraging an opposition confederacy of the southern States, a new German Empire springs, Phœnix like, from the ashes of her own ruin.

Prussia led and commauded the German army. That was her right and duty by virtue of her presidency in the North German Bund. Prussia, having twenty-four millions of the thirty-nine millions represented, furnished also by far the largest number of soldiers. She bore disproportionate burdens as a policy of reconciliation. Her landwehr were called out as reserves, when others were left peacefully at home. But the other States rallied cheerfully around the national standard, and not one murmured at the part that Prussia took. The great leaders are men of Prussia — Bismarck, Moltke, von Roon, Prince Frederick Charles, "Unser Fritz" the Crown Prince, and the Emperor, are all Prussians. Happy, indeed, is Germany in having such heroes at a time when heroes are needed. A great army of patient men, well disciplined, and having strong powers of endurance, was sent into the field, but what would it have been able to accomplish without leaders that knew how to handle them to advantage? Every movement is made orderly. A calm business spirit pervades the whole German army. Every man knows what Germany expects him to do, and he does it at the risk of his life. Unprejudiced critics have said, that Napoleon I. was a bungler along side of Moltke, and that Bismarck has no equal in statesmanship. The seven-months' war was a most admirably managed war on the part of Germany—she waited for a war declaration, she threw herself on the defensive, made her right in the quarrel appear clear to the people, commenced it with a general prayer and fast-day on the 29th of July, gave full encouragement to the religious

fervor of her people, and in the dispatches the hand of God was regularly and constantly acknowledged. The Christian and the humane spirit that characterized the German army is wonderful, even to the end. Had the war been protracted, it is not likely that such admirable discipline and Christian sentiment could have been maintained. The victorious army is, indeed, terrible in the execution of war measures, but it is as humane in resorting to war privileges. A London correspondent wrote: "The German army consists of the flower of the manhood and youth of Germany, recruited from all ranks of society, and therefore, as a matter of course, teeming with scholars, savants and students—men who will go to work very, very differently, from what the French very likely would have done, had they been able to accomplish their march upon Berlin."

That Germany had anticipated such a war, cannot be denied. For years, Prussia was preparing for it. Prussian military tactics, though not so brilliant in the outset, were considered the safest in the world. The French are impetuous in the onset, but they cannot endure steady resistance—Germans knew that. Heroic as the French are in the flush of victory, they are as cowardly in defeat—that the Germans knew. The German needle-gun is a good weapon, but the French chassepot excels it—that was acknowledged by both sides, but the Germans could turn an inferior weapon to better use than the French, because of their universal intelligence—every man being able to read and write, the French, on the contrary, universally ignorant.

A large and strong army, heroic leaders, an intelligent purpose, a fervent patriotism, a firm trust in God—these won the victory for Germany.

2. An article of this kind must necessarily fail to do justice to the Franco-Prussian war. We will not attempt to give a history of the war, or even to describe the epoch that has culminated so grandly for Germany—it takes a book to do that satisfactorily. The new empire is a fixed fact. It stands before us in grand proportions. What has gone before, is about as interesting as that which our eyes have wit-

nessed, for that is the stuff the present heroes are made of. To be true to our title, we must glance at the antecedents of this empire, and of the war that established it. Germany has a history that dates away back into the gray dawn of European life. The Germans are, historically, of Asiatic origin. The word *German* is traced back to ancient Persian sources, and has of late been supposed even to be traceable to the genealogical record of Genesis, to one Gomer, whose son Askenas gave name to one of the oldest German tribes, the *Askanians.* The Germans call themselves *deutsch*, and their country *Deutschland*, frequently, also, in the older writings, *teutsch* and *Teutschland.* The latter form, supposed to be derived from their god Thor, or one of their ancient tribes, the *Teutonians*, is not correct. *Deutsch* is derived from the Gothic *thiuda*, which the different dialects changed into *diot*, *diota*, *diet*, and the adjective forms of *dietisk*, dieutisch, *deutsch.* This word signified *the people*, *the nation*; a Deutscher, therefore, was one of the people, a man of the nation. This signification is not inappropriate, for the German character is peculiarly sociable, fond of society, confiding as the member of one large family.

The ancient Germans were a wild, freedom-loving, hardy, and rude out-of-doors people. They were known centuries before Christ, and made the Romans feel, on different occasions, that, though they had no military civilization, they knew how to defend their country. Nine years before Christ, Varus lost three legions in battle with the Germans, over which Augustus cried in vain: "Varus, Varus, give me back my legions!" Shortly after, Herman "mit der weissen Haare," freed the German forests of every Roman encroacher. Whilst the Romans sent many expeditions against them, and succeeded in conquering parts of the German people, they could never subdue them as a whole, and were most insecure in the possession of those they had conquered. In other respects, the ancient Germans were not known very much. Some of them served in the Roman armies, and were thus brought in contact with the civilization of those armies, but, generally

speaking, they stayed at home and cared little for the outside world.

Religion was a matter of very little importance to them. They had but few gods, and cared little about law or order. Their majestic oaks were dearer to them than the stage, the notes of forest-birds they preferred to the measures of Horace, Virgil, and Homer. Hence, too, we have no ancient literature. Schiller frequently lamented the absence of German mythology, to ornament his poems, and Goethe contented himself with nymph and fairy tales, stories of witches, the genii of the woods and mountains.

Bravery was the highest excellence of men, virtue that of women. The men were permitted to transgress the bounds of virtue, but the women were severely punished for the same improprieties. They made war on the beasts of the forest, and on any one who came in their way. He who distinguished himself for bravery and wisdom, became a leader; other chiefs or kings they had none, until a late period in their history. There is certainly much resemblance between them and our American Indians, being divided into independent tribes and having no bond of union except that of homogeneity. Whilst there were a few combinations of numerous tribes, such as under Maroboduns, in the first century, who succeeded in bringing an army of seventy thousand men under his sway, there appears to be no national bond until the eighth century. It was left to Charlemagne (the great Charles) to collect all the scattered tribes of middle and south-western Europe into one vast empire. Already in the fourth century, the many tribes seemed to have rallied into four centres—the Alemanni, the Franks, the Saxons, and the Goths. The sons of Charles could not hold these unruly parts together, and divided the empire, giving to Ludwig the greatest part of what at present constitutes Germany. There were, however, various changes. In the tenth century, the Saxon line came into possession of the crown, and Otto I., who was crowned in 962, by the pope, as "Emperor of the holy Roman Empire of the German nation," may be looked

upon as, in some sense, the first Emperor of Germany. The country then included large regions east and west of the Rhine, reaching down to the Mediterranean sea. It was a "Roman" empire, because it included Rome; "holy" because the pope crowned its monarchs; of the "German nation'" because the German nations now converted to Christianity, were the trunk of this power.

But it could not be held together. Frederick I., a Hohenstauffen prince, made heroic efforts toward the close of the twelfth century, to humble the heroes, who had gradually become nobles, and each of whom wanted to be supreme in power. He effected some sort of subordination, made the empire strong again for a little while, and is remembered for his heroism, as the ancient Barbarossa (the red-beard). But the empire was weakened as the princes became ambitious. When, in the time of the Reformation, Charles V., King of Spain, was made Emperor of the "holy Roman Empire of the German nation," the dukes and princes really governed Germany, although he had the nominal honor of being its Emperor; but he could not even retain that to the close of his life.

After him the house of Hapsburg (Austria) was advanced to the imperial crown. It held this title up to 1808, but its nominal rule has a sad history. It allowed Germany to be robbed of Alsace and Lorraine during the seventeenth century, and in the next century it proved powerless against the still more insolent encroachments of France, when Germany lost six thousand towns and districts. Austria occasioned the thirty years war (1612—1640), and in the twenty-three years war (1790—1813) it proved itself powerless to do anything for the defence of its nominal empire. In 1808 the house of Austria resigned the imperial honor, and in 1866 it was compelled to withdraw from all participation in German affairs.

In the beginning of the present century, Germany saw her greatest humiliation. Her Protestantism had ceased to be a power among the people; her morals were fashioned after the teachings of Paris; her Sundays became days of pleasure, of

public amusement, of riotous living; her churches stood empty, and her beer-gardens were crowded; her theologians had turned rationalists and, as many as dared to do so, French infidels, and her general situation was certainly gloomy. Napoleon I. seemed intent on blotting out the identity of the German nation, dignifying his favorite princes with the titles of kings, and parceling out large territories among his relatives and friends, so as to put the whole control of Germany under his influence. No statesmanship seemed able to arrest the national ruin. They formed the Rhine-bund immediately after Napoleon was dethroned, but it, too, proved a rope of sand, and where the hopes of Germany lay, no statesman could tell.

Amid the general gloom of 1813, there was a poet who seemed to see better days. Poet though he was, it is not improbable that Ernst Morris Arndt has done more to inspire the German mind with yearning for national unity, and to make the present German Empire possible, than all the statesmen, put together, have done, during the first half of the present century. He tuned his harp and sang:

WAS IST DES DEUTSCHEN VATERLAND?

"Where lies the German Fatherland?
On Suabian earth, by Prussian strand?
Where Rhine her blooming vineyards lave?
Or broods the gull on Baltic waves?
O no! no! no!
The Fatherland 's not bounded so!

Where is the German Fatherland?
Is 't Styria fair, Bavaria grand!
Is 't where the Marso cattle graze?
Is 't where the Marker's forges blaze?
O no, no, no!
The Fatherland 's not bounded so!

What is the German Fatherland?
Is 't Pommerland, Westphalia land?
Is 't where the sand o'er wide wastes blows?
Is 't where the Danube roaring goes?
O no, no, no!
The Fatherland 's not bounded so!

* * * * *

What is the German Fatherland?
Then name at least to me that land.
Wide as the German language rings,
And God in Heaven its praises sings;
That shall it be,
That, gallant German, name for thee!

That is the German Fatherland
Where oaths bind less than clasp of hand;
Where truth's clear beams from mild eyes dart,
And love and friendship fill the heart.

That is the German Fatherland,
Where scorn on foppery stamps its brand;
Where French and false like sense impart,
And German means o'erflowing hearts.

The mighty Deutschland shall it be!
O God, look down from Heaven and see,
And may our hearts with courage swell
To love it truly, love it well!"

The Germans sang this through all the years of political humiliation. In 1816 there was the Rhine Confederacy formed, of which Austria had the chairmanship, but that was a bond that bound nothing. Austria and Prussia were the leading powers; they, in their jealousy of each other, prevented even the little good that might otherwise have been accomplished by it. Some States sympathized with the one, some with the other power. We pass over the troubles of Germany during the time of the Rhine-Bund, and also over the wars with which she came more or less in contact, during her confederate history, as well as the revolutionary war of 1848, that effected nothing but an increased strength of monarchical institution, and confine ourselves to the immediate developments toward the present empire.

Frederick William IV., brother of the present Emperor, was, in 1849, elected Emperor of Germany with two hundred and sixty-seven votes against two hundred and sixty-three in the Féderal Parliament, but as Austria and the kingdoms of Germany protested against this election, he declined the honor. In 1866, the jealousies between Austria and Prussia had gone so far, that their claims to superiority had to be decided by the sword. Prussia, in her own name, declared war

against Austria, Saxony, Hanover and one division of Hessia, June 15th, 1866. In six weeks her victory was complete. She overcame the confederates in detail, and also defeated the powerful Austrian army, in a pitched battle at Sadowa or Koeniggrätz. With an army of two hundred and fifty thousand she took the field against three hundred and fifty thousand, and so complete and brilliant was her success, that King William, who had still been very unpopular, and especially so at the outbreak of what was considered a war of brothers, became popular with his people, and his chief adviser, Bismarck, was acknowledged to be a powerful statesman. William had put down the rebellion of 1848; he was known as a cold hearted, stern old soldier, who cared for no other business than to handle large armies, and who had no sympathy for the people. His antecedents were anything else than in sympathy with the liberal sentiments of the age, and none but the most bigoted monarchists could see any hope in the future that he should help to mould.

Otto von Bismarck became his chief adviser. He had been known as an ambitious, arbitrary, and reckless man. Born, in 1815, of wealthy parents, he had received a splendid education, but had thus far turned it to little good. But he was a strict monarchist, and had plans in his head that brought him into favor at the court. He represented Prussia at the court of Russia, and at the now ruined Tuilleries, but was called home in 1862 to take the practical management of affairs into his immediate control. He was a wonderful schemer. With foreign governments, he managed to keep on excellent terms, and shaped all matters to the realization of his pet idea. In so doing he had many a battle with the so-called liberal party, with men high in authority, who could not appreciate his schemes, but he cowered before no obstacle. He it was who risked the war with Austria, who managed its issues, and who gained his first point so gloriously, when Austria withdrew from German control, and a new confederacy was formed with the presidency of Prussia.

All the States north of the Main river entered voluntarily into this Norddeutscher-Bund; Hanover, one division of

Hessia, and several smaller principalities were incorporated into Prussia, giving it an addition of nearly five millions of inhabitants, and with the South-German States—Würtemburg, Baden, Bavaria and Kur-Hessia, a revenue treaty was agreed upon, that for the present was preferable to an actual union. These four powers were more and more drawn into sympathy with the Norddeutscher-Bund. Their absence enabled Bismarck to manipulate the members or the Confederacy the more completely. He became more and more popular with the nations of Europe; several times he prevented an outbreak of war. He learned to be cautious in his energy. In the Zollverein he drew the South German States fast enough, and at times even restrained the more hasty ones from forcing a union with the North. His next aim was to settle with France. When, in 1867, Napoleon wanted to meddle with Luxemburg, Bismarck told Benedetti that nine hundred thousand men would be put upon a war-footing unless France desisted from its war-preparations. This determined language had the desired effect, yet Bismarck knew a war with France must follow, sooner or later, and he shaped everything in that direction. In June, 1869, he said to some representatives of Bavaria: "I have spent a long, trying week, though it lasted only five days. The results of a war with France did not trouble me, for Moltke has given assurance that we shall be victorious; it was the question whether we shall enter upon such a war, even though we know that we shall win. I have concluded, only to accept war when it is forced upon us—the horrors of such a war I shall not want to be responsible for; for myself I shall enter upon it, only as an extreme necessity. If war is forced upon us, then we shall fight it out with all our strength, and you Bavarians may hurry up to be present at the first battle, which in all probability will be fought somewhere near Metz. When the war, thus anticipated, did break out, Bismarck became the mind and the counsel of Germany; he held the foreign powers in check, managed the unity of support at home, planned and developed the sentiment of the present peace terms, and he has been able to enthrone himself in the ad-

miration of the world as the wonderful statesman, for whom neither the past nor the present has an equal. This Bismarck is now the most important man in Germany, and has received the dignity of Prince of the the Empire.

3. The situation of the German Empire, is one of great interest to the world. A power so large, so vigorous, so intelligent and so heroic, can do mighty things, both for evil as well as for good. A former French king has said: "If I had the rule of Germany, not a drop of blood should be shed in all Europe without my consent." Weak as Germany is when divided, it is as naturally strong when united. It is bounded on the North by the North Sea, Denmark and the Baltic Sea; on the East by Russia, Russian Poland, Silesia, Bohemia, and upper Austria; on the South by Tyrol and Switzerland, and on the West by France, Belgium and Holland, occupying an area of two hundred and ten thousand square miles, and containing nearly forty-one millions of inhabitants, or one hundred and ninety to every square mile.

Physically, Germany can be divided into three parts—the lowlands of the North, the broken river and hill countries of the Middle, and the mountain slopes of the South. These natural characteristics are, however, interwoven with each other; the rivers leaping from the mountains of the south, burst through the villages and ravines of the middle land, and find their way through the plains of the north into the adjoining seas. The products of the soil and industrial pursuits adapted to the different localities, balance each other very evenly. Agriculture and grazing is followed in the north, business in the middle, and manufacture in the south parts of Germany. There is no country so well adapted to the support and the wants of a great nation, and no country would less admit of a satisfactory division between rivaling powers. The one great necessity of Germany is a united nationality; unity of action in the development of splendid natural resources, harmony in its commercial interests, protection to its manufacturing pursuits, encouragement to its mining facilities, a steady, peaceful and economical government.

As it was, two-thirds of the people had to struggle for an existence. The population was becoming too great for the quantity of land. Manufacturing was limited because of the little encouragement it received. The people are too poor to buy, and governments powerless in devising liberal inducements to great undertakings. Taxation became necessarily high; the governments were expensive; the wealthy would rather invest their money in foreign bonds than in home enterprises. Life-conditions became so indelibly fixed, that, as a rule, the ambition of men confined itself to an imitation of their fathers.

The wretched material condition, is what made the people emigrate to other lands as fast as they could get away. It is not the search for liberty that brings the German to America, but the prospect of bettering his condition. There have been colonies and individuals who came to these shores because they were oppressed at home beyond what they were willing to endure, especially in earlier times, and under the rule of an especially hateful and tyrannical sovereign; so also in war-times, to escape the burdens of war; young men, to escape the draft, who would then, after a few years, induce their kindred to follow them; and the multitudes of university students, school teachers, ministers, lawyers, doctors, and officers of the armies, who had participated in the attempted revolution of 1848, and who left the country—some in disgust at the turn things took, others because that uprising made them fanatical on the subject of liberty, and quite a large number because they were actually expatriated or under warrants of arrest.

The moral and spiritual condition of Germany is largely necessitated by the abject poverty of its lower classes. There is no mixing up of society, no passing over from one life-station to another, and hence a very one-sided development of character. The Sundays are not only days of pleasure, but with the laboring classes they are days of hard toil; the women do the mending and patching, for which they had no time during the week, and field labor of all sorts is quite common in the rural districts. Loose Sunday notions are

not the cause of this, but poverty, the feudal customs according to which landowners can exact labor without paying for it, the absolute necessity of the people to work for themselves on Sunday, who had to work all the week for their employers. Such a state of things is not conducive to good morals; it shuts out all the means of improvement and suppresses the spirit of ambition to rise in the world. In religion it may make them passively pious, but it prevents them from manifesting their piety in labors of love and deeds of charity. A large class of people are able to do as they wish, but a still larger class are powerless by the law of circumstances, to do anything beyond providing for their daily bread.

The insignificant governments were unable to remedy the many weaknesses of German life. Most of them had to struggle for their maintenance. They had to keep up standing armies and the whole machinery of an independent government where there was only a very small territory to govern, frequently not the size of a county or township in the United States.

In all these respects, Germany will benefit by the change. The government will be less expensive, can afford to be more generous, can do more for general improvements, protect the material interests of the country much more securely, and give a different tone and energy to undertakings for the welfare of the whole country. In its intellectual and religious pursuits, Germany cannot but be the gainer by the new order of things. The Universities will have more of a national type than heretofore; they will attract more students from abroad, as being under the protection of a powerful and great government, and it may be presumed that the new ideas of national unity will tend to elevate the national standard of education. In church matters, it was feared by timid souls, that Prussia would carry the "union" through all the Protestant churches, and thus endanger the existence of the Lutheran Church, and, to some extent, the Reformed also. But this is not at all probable. It is not likely that the national government would want to interfere in church matters to an

extent that would alienate many of its best citizens. The Empire could do itself no greater injury than to carry the union of the two churches of the Reformation through by force, or even by insinuation. There is no probability whatever, that anything of the sort will be attempted; on the contrary, much larger liberty of the individual conscience, of all tolerable sects, of Protestants, Catholics, Jews,—of Lutherans, Reformed and United,—may be confidently expected.

The empire has a strong Prussian cast, as the Bund had that prepared the way for the empire, and Prussia was not known as the most liberal power of Europe, or even of Germany; the southern powers had much more popular and liberal governments. Notwithstanding this, Germany will enjoy a higher type of freedom, imbibe more enlarged views, and be put in the way of more exalted progress under the empire than under the confused rule that has happily passed away.

The present constitution is that of the North German Confederacy, so changed as to admit of the empire. It is not believed to guarantee the people in those rights which they are entitled to, and Bismarck is known to regard the parliament only as a body sent there to advise with him and to sanction his measures. But a determined course is necessary at present. The more hopeful ones are entirely satisfied with him. It takes just such a man to carry on a revolution. He has shown, that he can be conciliatory when prudence dictates conciliation, and it is believed, that he will slacken the reins just as soon as the people are prepared to take them into their own hands.

As the Bund progressed, Prussia passed its own prerogatives over the federal government; so the federal government now allows itself to be gradually swallowed up in the empire. Norddeutscher-Bund is changed into *Deutsches Reich;* the president of the Bund, heretofore the King of Prussia, is now the Emperor of Germany. He is the chief executive, but not the law-making power. The Parliament, consisting of representatives from all the states of the empire, numbers

nearly four hundred members. There is a Bundesrath (the term Bund being still retained in many relations) and a Reichstag. The Reichstag is the popular branch of government. The Emperor need not sign the bills passed, nor has he the power of veto. The Bundesrath acts upon the measures to be placed before the Reichstag, and also confirms the measures passed. It is, to a great extent, executive, deciding and acting upon the exigencies, not clearly settled by law. It appoints committees of its own number, but in all cases so that they represent at least four States. No one can become a member of both branches of the government at one time. Every member of the Bundesrath has the right to appear and speak in the Reichstag, without asking for permission, especially in cases that affect the government he represents. The Bundesrath must give its consent to a declaration of war. It meets with the Reichstag, or independent of it, at the call of the Emperor, once a year, or oftener, as the case may be. The parliament meets now in Berlin. Measures have recently been taken to erect a new and suitable building for the assembly of this body. The period for which the members are elected, is three years. The Reichstag represents the people, not their local governments, and the members need not govern themselves by any instructions from their home governments. All transactions are public and regularly reported. The Reichstag settles and regulates all the commercial interests of the empire. Railroads remain independent, but the national government reserves the right to build new ones, or make use of the existing ones, as it may find necessary for the public defence. Postal and telegraph arrangements are taken entirely under the control of the national government. As already under the Confederacy, the troops had to swear allegiance to the President (King of Prussia), so now all the troops of the empire are under the personal and supreme control of the Emperor as Commander-in-chief. The Emperor represents the empire, receives foreign ambassadors, opens and closes the parliament, appoints the premier of the realm, who, by virtue of that appointment, becomes President of the Bundesrath. When the Bundesrath has acted on a mat-

ter that requires the action of the Reichstag, the Emperor lays it before them, and finally promulgates all measures acted upon. Whatever the emperor directs, must be signed by Bismarck (at present) who thereby assumes the responsibility.

The flag of the new empire is *black-white-red.* The first parliament of the new empire was opened in March last by William in person, who was then publicly acknowledged as Emperor. He sat upon a throne, brought from France, and supposed to have been used at the crowning of a former German emperor, more than eight hundred years ago. The session was preceded by a sermon from the court preacher Rogge, and the Emperor, followed by his attendants, kneeled in solemn prayer before he ascended the throne. It was the proper beginning of a new dynasty. The Prussian house enters upon a new inheritance. The throne of the German Empire is made the inherited possession of all succeeding kings of Prussia.

On the evening of the closing year, a minister's widow sat with her children, drawing scriptural lots for themselves for the new year. When they had finished drawing for themselves, a daughter of nineteen said, let us now draw for the new emperor, and the lot fell upon Haggai 2 : 9 : "The glory of the latter house shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts." They sent this incident to the King, then at Versailles, and Bismarck acknowledged the compliment by a special messenger sent to Stuttgart to hunt up the family. May we not hope that there is something prophetic in this?

The German Empire is really very much like the Union of our States. The government of its twenty-eight States have, of course, more power as they remain in authority for life, and the power is transmitted to their rightful heirs. But the general plan of the empire is very similar to our republic, and when organized upon a little more liberal basis, it will possess many excellencies that the rivalries of party, and the thirst for office in this country, cannot have.

The freedom of the press, of speech, and of religion, is as

unlimited as it need be; there are some wholesome restrictions placed upon it that an empire would necessarily resort to, but, upon the whole, the people of Germany will have no occasion to yearn for a better government.

The Emperor, though stern and severe, is a positively pious man. When he left Berlin, he said: "Mit Gott;" in all his despatches he acknowledged the care of a kind Providence, and in his last despatches, he gave God the glory for the great victory.

He is also a Protestant. Prussia has been known as intensely Protestant. All his advisers are Protestants, and this fact will give quite a different direction to affairs in the German Empire from what they had under the presidency of Austria. The Catholics may clamor. They have, indeed, sixty-five representatives in the German Reichstag, and they have, at different times, by a solid vote, shown that they love Catholicism more than the welfare of Germany. In the answer to the address from the throne, they insisted upon a clause, urging the Emperor to send three hundred thousand men to Rome, to reinstate the Pope in his lost secular possessions, but their motion received a vote of two hundred and forty-three to sixty-three, and that will be about the result of all their efforts. The Emperor has had to humor the Pope a little during the war, so as to keep harmony in his ranks, but as for favoring Catholic legislation, or allowing Germany to re-enthrone the Pope, there is no indication of any probability in that direction. The Catholics have done well. They have fought nobly against a Catholic power. It is right that they should be respected in their religious views and have the full protection, in religion as well as in politics, that the mighty German Empire can give; but when they become arrogant and presumptuous, as they are so apt to do when encouraged a little, the men who understand their Jesuitical scheming everywhere, will know how to handle them.

The freedom-shriekers, those of the Protestanten-verein, the fanatics for social and labor reforms, will likely exert a wider influence than the Catholics. The tendency is now to enthusiasm, to hasty words and deeds, big talk of progress.

Though this tendency was checked in 1848, largely by the severe measures of the present Emperor, then Commander-in-chief, under his brother, King Frederick William IV., it is likely to receive a new impetus after the imposing impression of the present is worn away. There is a radical element brewing up that does not augur well for the religious future of the new empire.

The religious earnestness of the present may become permanent and bear good fruit, but the danger is, that the pride of such wonderful success, the fulsome congratulations of all the world, will make the Germans vain in their Thatcraft (a word never used so frequently as of late) and make them forget that righteousness exalteth a nation. O, how Germany learned to pray last summer! How the people kept the 29th of July like a day of solemn wrestling with God! How they have prayed in the public congregation, in the prayer-meeting room, at the family hearth, in the camp, and on the battle-field, for blessings upon their task to drive back and punish an insolent and unreasonable neighbor! Let Germany continue now to give God the glory, that will help her wonderfully in the future.

ARTICLE VII.

CHURCH-LOVE AMONG OUR PEOPLE.

By Rev. G. Diehl, D. D., Frederick, Md.

By Church-love we understand something more specific than a general appreciation of the excellencies, glories and blessings of the Church universal. It is not merely delight in Christian services and a devotion to religious interests. The object of special attachment and devotion is not the entire body of the acknowledged followers of Christ; nor the whole company of Christ's elect,—all whom he has called to be his people and who constitute the entire community of true believers.

The feeling has reference to a branch only of the Church catholic;—some body of Christians organized under a particular polity, bearing a distinctive name, with distinctive features in doctrines, forms of worship, or church discipline and government. By the expression, we usually mean the attachment which a member feels to his own particular church, or the denomination of Christians with which he is identified. In a Lutheran, it is warm attachment and deep devotion to the Lutheran Church. In a Presbyterian, or Methodist, it is the same feeling to the particular denomination with which he stands connected.

Gieseler says: "The Christian Church is a religious-moral society, connected together by a common faith in Christ, and which seeks to represent in its united life, the kingdom of God announced by Christ." Arnold says: "Christianity contains, on the one hand, a divine philosophy which it may call its religion, and a divine polity which is its Church."

The members of every religious society would naturally feel some preference for their own peculiar ecclesiastical organization. To be entirely without this attachment, would argue a most perverse state of mind. In a country in which all enjoy the largest freedom of conscience and action, it is presumed a man would not remain in a church for which he could not cherish a proper regard.

In some of the churches of this country the people seem to be more deeply devoted to the interest of their distinctive denomination than in our Church. Not that all our people are deficient in this particular. The Lutheran Church has members in whose bosoms Church-love glows with great fervor. They appreciate the excellencies of their Church. They delight in her services; believe in the purity of her doctrines, and are deeply devoted to her interests. In her usages, ceremonies, confessional standards, polity, forms of worship, and in her entire ecclesiastical organization, they believe her to be more completely conformed to the scriptural ideal, and more wisely adapted to the genius of American institution, than any other church.

On the other hand, no well-informed person will deny that

a large portion of the Lutheran people of this country, are not characterized by deep devotion to their own church. They have no warm ecclesiastical or sectarian feeling. A variety of causes have produced this indifference, into which we shall not enquire at present. The attention of the reader will be directed to the single question:

HOW CAN CHURCH-LOVE AMONG OUR PEOPLE BE FOSTERED AND DEEPENED?

Inasmuch as a strong sectarian feeling is indispensable to the religious zeal which prompts Christians to devote all their energies and means to the cause of Christ, the Lutheran Church should devise plans, and make efforts to strengthen and deepen the attachment and devotion of her members to their own ecclesiastical organization. In the Protestant Church, divided as she is into several leading denominations, no large amount of good has been accomplished, without a large mixture of strong sectarian feeling. In the present state of the Church, sectarian feeling is therefore an excellent thing, and almost essential to a high degree of energy and usefulness in the service of Christ.

What can be done for the improvement of the religious character of our people in this respect? What plans shall be adopted? what policy pursued to produce in the minds of her children, a warm devotion to the Lutheran Church? We might look at the question in the abstract, and reason from general principles, and the philosophy of the human mind. Or we may look into those churches that are characterized by a warmer Church-love than our own, and inquire into the causes that produced this feeling. By either process we should arrive at the same result. Discovering in other denominations the springs from which the feeling of sacred ecclesiastical attachment flows, we may inquire whether similar fountains may not be awakened in the hearts of our people.

1. The cultivation of this feeling should begin in early life. Children should be taught to regard with sacred veneration and attachment the church of their fathers, at whose altars

they were baptized and consecrated. Parents who themselves feel a deep devotion to their church, will find no difficulty in inspiring the minds of their children with the same feeling. Let them hold up to the view of their children, the best features of the church, in her doctrines, services, books of devotion and ecclesiastical literature. Let them speak of her glorious history. Let them teach Luther's noble faith in the Church, as he lays it down in the Larger Catechism. "I believe that there is a holy community on earth of pure saints, under one head, Christ, called together through the Holy Ghost, in one faith, mind and understanding, with various gifts, yet concordant in love, free of heresy;—that I am a part and member of the same, and a participant and co-partner of all their blessings; incorporated with them through the Holy Ghost by the hearing and reading of the word. Thus, until the last day, will the divine Spirit abide in this Church, through which he teaches and sanctifies us, that we may daily increase in the strength of our faith and the fruits of holy living. Through Christ divine grace is obtained in this Church, and sanctification wrought by the Holy Ghost in the use of the word and the sacraments in union with this Church."

All that is beautiful and attractive in religion should be associated with the Church in the minds of children. The Bible as there read and expounded, and all that is sublime in morals, noble in sacred literature, touching in the inspired narratives of the Scriptures, and all that is precious in the hope of a blissful immortality, should be coupled in their thoughts with their own Church. Their training should make them feel that the Church is the true source of spiritual illumination and the instrument of salvation, and that it is in the Church that a divine life is wrought in the soul of a believer, whereby he is united to God, walks before him in holiness, finally dies in his favor, and is received into his eternal glory. He should regard the Church as the visible embodiment of the Savior's manifestation and work in our world. And the youthful heart will be drawn out in admir-

ation toward an institution that embodies all that is pure, and good and noble and great and beneficent.

2. Regular and exclusive attendance, during childhood and youth, upon the services of their own Church, will foster this feeling. The deep and abiding devotion of Roman Catholics to their Church grows out of their early training, when they are never allowed to witness any but Romish services. In those portions of the Protestant Churches, where the people are most earnestly devoted to the interests of their own denomination, it will be found upon examination, that a sectarian training, especially in exclusive attendance, in early youth, upon their denominational church-services, was a prominent agency in bringing about this result. All the tenets instilled into the mind will be in harmony with their denominational standards. All ideas formed by the child, of goodness, of salvation, and of heaven, will be associated with his own Church. He will learn the essentials of the Christian religion without any distraction of though. With his growth in years and stature, and the development of his powers, there will grow up in his nature a Church-love and piety, steadfast and reliable. If our Church is ever to be blessed with sons and daughters in all her congregations, who will be faithful and devoted under all circumstances, her children will have to be brought up in conformity to this practice.

This training, which some will call sectarian, will not interfere with an enlarged charity and correct views of the Church universal, as "that one mystical body of which Christ is the sole head, and in the unity of which all saints are necessarily included as constituent parts;"—that Church for which Christ gave himself; chosen in him before the foundation of the world; which he cherishes as his own flesh; to which coming we are built up a spiritual house, a holy temple; the bride of Christ; the light of the world, the salt of the earth; through which the Saviour accomplishes his work of teaching, comforting, sanctifying and saving believers. Nor will it interfere with the mingling of Christian people of different denominations in general union associations. There

are several great institutions or societies binding the several Churches together in the great work common to all. The Tract and Bible Societies and Sunday School Union have done much in breaking down bigotry, prejudice and narrowness of views. Young Men's Christian Associations affording a common ground on which the forces of all the Churches may combine their powers in assailing the works of darkness, have no doubt accomplished much good. The most devoted attachment to a denominational Church, is not inconsistent with the most comprehensive charity, nor does it unfit the church-member for cordial co-operation with Christians of every name in those grand undertakings, in which all the forces of Christendom may combine in gigantic assaults on error and sin.

But excepting the general societies, every close observer of these things must have noticed, that frequent union meetings in ordinary religious services has had a tendency to weaken the attachment of our members to their own Church. In such association, Lutherans usually come in contact with people of much stronger sectarian feelings than their own. The services take their tone from other Churches. In such meetings the controlling spirit is not Lutheran, but Methodist, Presbyterian, or some other form of sectarianism. The members of other Churches bring into these meetings much stronger denominational feelings than the Lutheran. The result is easily foreseen. The Lutheran Church loses and others gain by the contact. Until our Church shall be delivered from the sentiment so general among our people and clergy thirty years ago, and still very prevalent, that, as all evangelical Churches have the essentials of religion, it matters very little where the young people may go, we will be constantly losing our members. So long as this sentiment, imbibed in childhood and strengthened with growing years, shall find encouragement, the baptized members of the Lutheran Church will be drawn from her sanctuaries by the influence of associates, and the Church robbed of her proper and legitimate materials of growth. An unwise liberalism, encouraged by many leading men of a generation that has

almost passed away, has shorn the Lutheran Church of her strength and glory. If you know who are the companions and associates of the young people in many Lutheran congregations, you can tell of what denominations they will ultimately become members. Do they associate with Episcopalians, they will be drawn into the Episcopal Church. Do they associate with Methodists, they will join that Church. All the sacred obligations of fidelity to the Church in which Providence placed them, and to which they were consecrated by holy vows in baptism, are sacrificed to the mere attraction of companionship in social life. While the Lutheran pastor is conducting service in his own church, some of his young people will be found in half dozen churches of other names, having been drawn thither by their company, and never thinking that they are trampling upon one of the most sacred obligations that can lie on a human being. Those notions of liberalism so pestilential in their influence on our Church, should be counteracted. One step toward it would be gained by securing the uniform attendance of the youth of the Church on exclusively Lutheran services. Prosmiscuous associations, in all the relations of life, tend to weaken a paramount attachment to an individual object. In religious communities the practice is equally pernicious.

3. A revival of the old practice of confirming baptized members at an early age would have a beneficial effect. Like every other goad, this is liable to abuse. Sometimes children may have been received to full communion in the Church without adequate knowledge and experience. But this is no argument against the general practice of receiving, at an early age, by confirmation, the baptized children. To neglect pressing this duty on their minds with such prayerful and persevering earnestness as will generally move the mind of the child, is to make infant baptism an unmeaning ceremony. Infant baptism rests on the authority of the parent to bind the child to the service of Christ. All the essential promises made in baptism are made by the child. The parent speaks in the name of the child. A time must come when the obligation is to be discharged, and that period is in early youth.

Confirmation is the formal transfer of the obligation. The child openly assumes vows made in his name. The treaty made by the representative is now ratified by the party in whose name the representative spoke. This is unquestionably the true and scriptural theory of infant baptism. And it imperatively demands confirmation at an early age,—in those youthful days that have given sufficient maturity to the powers and susceptibilities of the soul to understand the duty and feel the force of the obligation. Let the youthful soul in that tender period when the feelings are buoyant, the imagination gorgeous, the spirit susceptible, the heart gushing with happiness, and the enchantments of hope throw a loveliness over every object, be brought by confirmation into the Church, and religion will be deeply impressed on the soul. Christianity will forever afterwards stand forth to the imagination and the heart robed in loveliness. The services and ordinances connected with confirmation, will leave a charm on the spirit that years cannot weaken. The Church will be associated with so much of beauty and joy, that an attachment will spring up, ripening with increasing years.

That the baptized children may be properly prepared for confirmation with the rising morn of life, faithful parental training and prayerful pastoral instruction, under the blessing of God, are indispensable. The affection and confidence of the child must be won by the pastor before they leave the Sunday School class. Catechetical exercises must be made attractive and solemnly impressive. Religion must be arrayed in her attractive robes to those who are just blooming into youth. If such sentiments were instilled into the youthful mind, and such fidelity practiced by parent and pastor, the time would come when, as in former days, it would be considered disreputable in a young man or woman to have grown up in a Lutheran family, and yet not to be confirmed when the age of majority is attained. Then, too, would our people feel a deep devotion to their Church.

4. The culture of the virtue of which we are thinking, will be aided by giving every church-member something to do for the Church. God bestows upon his saints various gifts and

talents. Some he endows with the gift of prayer and exhortation. Others possess peculiar skill in elucidating truth. Some have financial and executive ability. Others are peculiarly adapted to healing difficulties and reconciling alienations. Every gift and every grace should be called into active exercise. The Lutheran Church needs a thorough and systematic organization that will give to every member full scope for the exercise of all his talents. In the various departments of the Church—in the Sunday School, in the prayer-meeting, in the choir, in the ladies sewing society, in the training of the children in sacred music, in offices of charity, in the raising of funds for home and foreign objects, in reconciling alienations, in gathering young people into the pastor's catechetical class, in searching out the careless and encouraging their attendance upon church services, in managing the finances of the church and other departments of Christian activity, every member should find work to engage his interest and call forth his energies. Persons always value that which has cost them something in labor or thought, or anxiety, or sacrifice or money. If you would bind a people by strong ties to their Church, let them labor and pray for it and contribute their substance for its support.

5. It would increase the reverence and attachment of the people to our Church, if they would more frequently "walk about Zion;" "tell the towers thereof; mark well her bulwarks, and consider her palaces." There is so much to challenge admiration in the Lutheran Church, in her doctrines and polity, her glorious history, the wonderful erudition of her theologians, the deep piety of many of her saints, and the integrity of the masses of her people, that her own children should be encouraged to contemplate her excellencies and glories. Her best features should often be held up in their true colors. Her defects should not be magnified, as some have done. Our Zion, like the sun, has some spots; but, like the god of day, in her, also, the blemishes are not perceptible to the naked eye in the effulgence of her glory. But some are fond of viewing this luminary through an obscuring medium, to diminish the splendor and bring out the opake spots.

Let the Church be looked upon with the natural eye, and the little darkness will be lost in the flood of glory.

6. In laboring for the improvement of our people, in the direction indicated, it will be well to throw around the Church all appropriate attractions. The profound and philosophic sentiment uttered by Wesley, that the devil should not have all the good music, admits of considerable extension. He should not have all the fine architecture, and eloquence, and poetry, and painting. The temple reared after God's own ideal, was splendid beyond description. The best of everything was devoted to religion. Many of the attractions of life might be rescued from the service of sin, and devoted to Christ. Many an attraction might be thrown around the services of religion. Whatever poetry and music can do in sacred song, and eloquence achieve in the pulpit, should be freely given, so that to the young religion would appear in a fascinating garb. The sanctuary, the chapel and the Sunday School room should be conformed to the demands of taste in architecture and adornment. With every refinement that cultivation and genius can lend, the aim must ever be to touch the heart and rouse the conscience. The Damascus blade will not be the less effective by reason of its brilliant polish. The highest literary excellence in the Sunday School and other books of the Church, will not diminish their moral power. Eloquence in the pulpil will not detract from its unction or its power.

7. Uniformity in services and doctrines, is an important element in the production of a strong Church-love. A Church embracing so many nationalities, and employing so many tongues in conducting her services, cannot be expected to have as much uniformity as smaller bodies confined to one or two countries. The Church in this country gathered from all those nationalities, and speaking half a dozen of languages, will necessarily manifest some diversities. It will require the influence of time, a profounder acquaintance with the genius of the Lutheran Church and the merging of many languages into the one controlling language of the country, to make our Church a complete unit. Yet we should ever

labor toward this result. We should never unduly magnify the differences that do really exist. There should be less angry controversy. Our Church papers should have more short, sharp, pithy articles. We should look more at the great essential doctrines, with large liberty on minor points. But we cannot expect entire accord, or uniformity. Among a people so free, inquisitive, and thoughtful, so bold in investigation, so independent in judgment, as the Lutherans are, different thinkers will express different views on matters not clearly and fully revealed. Melanchthon's noble motto should be inscribed on all our banners, "in essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity." If this sentiment would govern all active and influential men, our Church, notwithstanding our diverse nationalities and languages, and variations in modes of worship, placing herself on moderate ground would soon attain a sufficient degree of uniformity for the cultivation of the virtue of deep devotion to the Church.

Other elements in the production of this feeling might be mentioned. An increase in the fervor of the piety of our people; larger communications of grace, and refreshing showers in the gifts of the Holy Spirit, giving depths and fulness to religious experience, unction and power to our services of worship, and elevated holiness to the characters and lives of our Church members, would probably do more than anything else toward awakening our people to a more devoted Church-love. Knowing what is to be done, let us employ reasonable means to accomplish the result. Let us begin with the children. "We know of a truth that this Church in which saints live, truly does exist, and shall remain upon the earth, that there are some children of God scattered through the world in all kingdoms, islands, countries, and cities, from the rising to the setting sun, who have obtained the true knowledge of Christ and the gospel in this Church." (Melanchthon.) Let us labor to develop the lovely grace of deep and fervent love to this Church.

ARTICLE VIII.

FEMALE EDUCATION.

By Rev. Prof. P. M. Bikle, A. M., Lutherville, Md.

The subject, stated in this general form, may promise too much. It is not our purpose to enter into the discussion of it in all its bearings; nor to argue the question of natural difference between the male and female mind, and develop a theory of education suitable to each. We wish rather to speak of the apparent indifference in reference to the cause in our Church, and then add a few reflections on the general subject. Perhaps, therefore, a better statement would be,

FEMALE EDUCATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The Church, like every individual, has its short-comings. It is true, too, that the one, like the other, does not derive much pleasure from being told of them. But, however unpleasant it may be, it often proves beneficial by reminding of imperfections, and inducing to seek a remedy for defects. It is well thus for the Church often to call to mind its neglected interests, and endeavor to give more attention to them.

Every one will acknowledge our duty to foster carefully every important interest and institution we have. That this is not done, the calls for help from all directions give abundant evidence. With deep regret we see that many of our interests are not as prosperous as they should be, simply because they do not receive the attention they deserve. For instance, it is far from affording us gratification to contemplate our Foreign Mission work. It is not very extensive, and even that is not supported vigorously, either with men or money. The same might be said of the Home Mission field.

How is it with Female Education? Are we doing what we should in that direction? The charge has been made that

we are not *wide awake* on the subject. Is the charge well-founded? To see that it is, will require only a cursory glance at the evidence.

1. *The silence of the* REVIEW. We have examined nearly the full set of the *Evangelical Review*, but have not found a single article on this subject. Whence this silence, if not from a lack of interest in the cause? We find nearly every other enterprise of the Church treated of, but this has been overlooked. It is true, the general subject of education has received attention in a number of articles, but, upon reading them, it will be readily seen that the writers had in view mainly, if not altogether, the education of young men. The educational training of our young women has been passed by without notice.

2. *The little attention it receives in our Church papers.* They are the medium of communication with our people, and it is chiefly through them, that both the ministry and laity learn the condition and wants of the Church. In them, therefore, the effort should be made to have these clearly and forcibly presented. We know it is not a very gracious thing to engage in fault-finding, and that it is much easier to point out defects in others than to do better ourselves, yet this should not deter us from stating them when deemed necessary. On most points, our religious papers have been faithful to a gratifying degree. We find in them frequent reports on Missions, and earnest appeals in their behalf; practical suggestions on the duties of Christian life; spirited discussions of controverted points; urgent appeals for the endowment of our Colleges and Theological Seminaries; and valuable articles on nearly every other subject of general importance. But on the importance of giving the daughters of the Church a thorough education, and of generously supporting our Female Seminaries, there is very little said. This we regard as another evidence of not fully realizing the importance of this interest.

3. *The Seminaries we have—their number, &c.* We turn to the Church Almanac, and find a list of *nine*. This may be regarded by some as a respectable number, and perhaps it

could be with some reason, if all were well sustained. But even if this were the case, our Church would not appear in a very favorable light on comparing statistics. Look at the Romish Church. From their Almanac for this year, we learn that they have three hundred and fifty educational institutions in the United States. Of these the names of one hundred and sixty are given, together with the number of teachers, pupils, &c. The list embraces one hundred and eleven young ladies' academies. Now it is fair to suppose, that of the whole three hundred and fifty, the female schools will bear the same proportion. According to that, there are in all about two hundred and thirty. How will this compare with the number of members in the two churches? We know there are more Roman Catholics than Lutherans, but surely not twenty-five times as many, nor even twelve times, taking the number of institutions given in the table. And doing this, how will the number of pupils compare? Their one hundred and eleven Seminaries have over twelve thousand, our nine not more than six hundred. Taking this as a basis of calculation, there would be in the United States twenty times as man Romanists as Lutherans. This we know is not the case, though we have not now at hand the means of ascertaining the exact proportion. Whether we would suffer so much in a comparison with the different branches of the Protestant Church, is doubtful, but it is very certain that we are far from being as fully alive to the importance of Female Education as the great Church of error, or as we should be.

4. *The Institutions we have, with but one exception, are in private hands.* Through the indefatigable efforts of Rev. G. D. Bernheim, the Seminary at Mt. Pleasant, N. C., has been secured to the North Carolina Synod. The others, however, although they have the recognition and recommendation of the different Synods, are not, strictly speaking, Church Institutions. Some of our wealthy and enterprising ministers and laymen have done for the Church what the Church should do for itself. But how soon these, that we have, may be lost to us, we do not know. One thing is certain, they are not as

securely in our possession as they would be if they were the property of the Synods; unless we are willing to admit that a few members are not as likely to yield to an occasional heavy pressure as a large portion, or even the whole Church.

These circumstances, we think, will serve to show, at least in part, the want of interest in the cause of Female Education, manifested by the Lutheran Church in our country. Let us now view its importance. To do so, as fully as it deserves, would make this paper much longer than we desire it to be. We shall, therefore, briefly state only a few points.

1. Justice requires, that woman should be educated as well as man. This part of "Woman's Rights" should be readily conceded by all, no matter how much the many foolish and unscriptural features of the general subject may be condemned. The day is past, at least where the beneficent rays of the Sun of Righteousness shine, for woman to be considered the slave or toy of man. She is now his companion, and should receive educational advantages suitable to her position.

2. All agree to the general principle, that the intellect should be well cultivated. We admire a symmetrically-formed body, but still more a well-developed mind. The former we supply with food and exercise for its nourishment, growth and strength; and we do this, both for its own proper and healthful condition, and to render it fit for the labors of life. Thus we may have an eye to what is *useful*, in a sense that is in no way objectionable. None the less, but rather more, should we endeavor to give the mind as complete a development as possible, by a rigid and judicious course of discipline. This should be done for its own sake, even if there were no other reason for it. But, when we consider the high degree of dignity it confers upon man, and the qualifications it gives him for a sphere of the greatest usefulness, both the incentive and duty to give it this development, become the stronger. This applies to all. No exception can be made in the case of females. If the object of education is to unfold, direct, and strengthen the intellect, that it may become a zealous and successful *seeker after truth;* to give it control of its

own powers, and to teach it towards what those powers should be directed; to train the senses to observe accurately, the memory to register carefully and recall readily, and the reason to compare, reflect, and judge without partiality or passion, we see no reason why it should not be given to all alike. If we take what may be termed a purely practical or utilitarian view of it, the education of young men may seem more important than that of young women. And this may be the reason why more attention is paid to the former than to the latter, notwithstanding the unqualified acknowledgment, that all should receive a thorough intellectual training.

3. But, even in viewing the subject of Female Education with reference to its *usefulness*, we find much in its favor. We do not, however, wish to use the term in the sense of acquiring a sustenance, but, in the higher sense, of being useful in *society*, in the *Church*, and in the *family*.

How much *society* needs improvement, in this direction, is apparent upon very little reflection. The women, whose education is of such a grade as to make them a power in the community, are few. And there is no prospect of our young women becoming any better, unless more attention be given to their educational training, and that training become more thorough than it is in many of our institutions. At present they are sadly deficient. The vast majority of them are "as idealess as a blank sheet of paper" on nearly everything else except dress, fashion, &c. Introduce a subject in the social circle, whose discussion requires a reasonable knowledge of history, philosophy, or substantial literature, and you are immediately at sea. Start an enterprise in the community, whose management requires more than an ordinary degree of intelligence, and in which it is necessary for women to have the controlling power, and the difficulty at once presents itself, to find enough that are qualified. Now, it may be objected, that a want of intelligence is not the cause, and that a thorough education would not be an efficient remedy. It might not be the only one, but, that it would prove in a high degree *efficient*, is shown by those communities that have reaped the benefits of institutions of learning.

The *Church*, too, would gain much. The intelligent members are the ones upon whom the pastor chiefly relies. To these he looks for advice and encouragement, and from them he can reasonably expect the most vigorous co-operation. This applies to the women of the congregation as well as to the men. One earnest, intelligent woman, whose heart is in the great work of the Church, will do more to promote its progress—social as well as moral—than a score of ignorant ones, no matter how commendable their piety may be. The enlightened mind and sanctified heart, must go together. The one is weak without the other. Evidently, then, one of the best means a minister could use for promoting the interests of his flock, would be, to see that the two are united. Whilst he labors for their spiritual improvement, he should also do all in his power for their intellectual culture.

Now turn from the Church to the *family*. Consider the moulding influence of the mother upon her offspring, and the necessity of her being well educated, will be seen at once. Youth is universally and rightly regarded as the most critical period of human life. But it is not, as many regard it, the period beyond all others, in which the character is formed for good or bad. It is the period, not so much of the *formation*, as of the *development* of character. The character, in all its main points, is formed before youth. The seeds, whether good or bad, are planted in very early childhood; even commencing within the first year; but they remain more or less dormant until youth; when, feeling the warmth of passion, and illuminated by the light of reason, they expand into leaf, flower, and fruit, filling the air with fragrance and beauty, or poisoning it with noxious odors. Now the care of the child devolves chiefly upon the mother. She sows the earliest seeds. And when we remember her moulding influence upon the plastic mind, surely it will not be difficult to see the importance of Female Education—the importance of training woman to fill the glorious sphere which Providence has assigned her. She is the artist, that paints the picture of beauty or deformity, and in order that it may be the former,

she should receive that with which, under God's blessing, she could execute her work most skilfully and successfully.

Thus we have briefly given a few points, showing the lack of interest in this work on the part of the Lutheran Church, and also a few reflections on its importance. *Whether the education of young women should be different from that of young men, and, if so, in what its distinctive character should consist,* we leave for some one else to discuss. It is certainly worthy of some attention.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological.—Among the noticeable publications of the last quarter, is *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology,* By Dr. C. P. Krauth, from the press of J. B. Lippincott & Co. For some account of the work, see Book Notices of this number.

Another *Commentary on Romans* has been furnished, in a volume of 646 pages, by Wm. S. Plumer, D. D. Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York. We note the appearance of two more volumes of *Lange's Commentary,* one containing the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded, by Dr. C. W. E. Naegelsbach, Translated, enlarged, and edited by Samuel R. Asbury; and *The Lamentations* of Jeremiah, expounded by the same, and translated by W. H. Hornblower, D. D.; and the other, *The Gospel of St. John,* edited by Dr. P. Schaff. J. B. Lippincott & Co. have published *Wordsworth Commentary* on the Book of Daniel and the Minor Prophets.

Fresh Leaves in the Book, and its Story, by L. R. R., furnishes valuable historical and archæological matter for the popular elucidation of the Holy Scriptures—noticed elsewhere in this number.

The *Atonement,* in its Relation to the Covenant, the Priesthood, and the Intercession of our Lord; by Rev. Hugh Martin M. A. (Smith English & Co.), presents an earnest discussion of this fundamental doctrine of Christianity in harmony with the Calvinistic system. A *Treatise on Regeneration* by Wm. Anderson, LL. D., of Glasgow, is published by the same house.

In *Sermons to the Natural Man,* by Dr. G. F. Shedd, author of the "History of Christian Doctrine," and issued by Chas. Scribner & Co., a volume

is given, marked by the vigorous thought, and forcible, finished style characteristic of the able author.

Ten Great Religions: an Essay in Comparative Theology, by James Freeman Clarke, is published by Jas. R. Osgood & Co., Boston. Dr. Clarke is restricted in his views by no regard to ecclesiastical "orthodoxy," and his work is pervaded by the rationalistic spirit and method. Of similar spirit, but much more radical in its rejection of the truths of Christianity, is a volume of 326 pages, by John Weiss, entitled *American Religion*, from the press of Roberts Brothers, Boston.

D. Appleton and Co. have published a new edition of *The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*, and its relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity, by Wm. Stroud, M. D.—a book that attracted considerable attention some years ago. Archbishop Whately's *Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Bonaparte*, and Historic Certainties respecting the Early History of America, has been republished by Robert Carter & Bros.

The *Problem of Evil*; translated from the French of M. Ernest Naville, mentioned among British books in last number, has been issued in this country by Carlton & Lanahan (Methodist Book Concern).

Chas. Scribner & Co. announce a work by President Woolsey, of Yale College, under the title, *The Religion of the Present and the Future.*

Scribner, Welford & Co. have imported Vol. XIX. of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, containing the *Seven Books of Arnobius.*

Scientific and Philosophical.—Many publications of this class are appearing, very frequently, showing the strong current of interest and thought in the questions and relations of Philosophy and Science.

Dr. Jas. M'Cook's *Christianity and Positivism*; Lectures delivered in New York, January 16th to March 20th, 1871, on the "Ely Foundation" of the Union Theological Seminary, and published by Carter & Bros., is described in our Book Notices.

Science, Philisophy and Religion, it the title of a volume of Lectures, delivered last winter before the Lowell Institute at Boston, presenting an able discussion of some of the latest aspects of skeptical speculation.

Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., whose works, "Ecce Cœlum" and "Pater Mundi," have gained the author a sudden reputation, has given to the public a new volume, entitled, *Ad Fidem*, or Parish Evidences of the Bible—a volume that will sustain the reputation already won.

An elaborate work, embracing the modern discoveries and sciences of Physical Geography, under title of *The Earth*, by E. Réclus, in two vols., translated from the French, is published by G. P. Putnam & Sons, New York. In *Wake-Robin*, by John Burroughs, 1 vol., Hurd & Houghton, the author furnishes seven interesting and valuable Lectures on different aspects of Ornithology.

Fragments of Science for Unscientific People, a Series of Detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews, by John Tyndall, LL. D., F. R. S., has been published by D. Appleton & Co., pp. 422.

Hereditary Genius; An Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences; by Francis Galton, F. R. S., appears in a new and revised edition, from the press of D. Appleton & Co. Also the 2d Vol. of Darwin's *Descent of Man. Questions of Modern Thought*, or a Series of Lectures on Modern Infidelity, delivered in Philadelphia last winter, has been brought out by Ziegler & McCurdy.

Historical and Biographical.—The *Life and Times of Lord Brougham*, written by himself, has been published in three vols. by Harper & Brothers. The second volume of *The Life of Nathaniel Greene*, by George Washington Greene, has been published by Hurd & Houghton—the work to be completed in a third volume. Other volumes in this department are, *Alfred the Great*, by Thomas Hughes, M. P., with Maps and Illustrations; *History of Florida*, from its Discovery by Ponce de Leon, in 1512, to the close of the Florida War, in 1842, by Geo. B. Fairbanks, from press of J. B. Lippincott & Co.; *History of the State of New York*, by John R. Brodhead, 2 vols.; *France Before Europe*, by Jules Michelet, translated from the French, and issued from the press of Roberts Brothers; a revised edition of Mr. Sargent's *Life of Andre*, issued by D. Appleton & Co.

General Literature.—Among the noticeable works of this class, we mention *Success and its Conditions*—a collection of Essays and Occasional Writings, by Mr. E. P. Whipple, from the house of Jas R. Osgood & Co.; a small, but most valuable volume, *Culture and Religion*, in some of their Relations, by J. C. Shairp, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator, St. Leonard, and St. Andrews, reprinted from the Edinburgh edition, by Messrs. Hurd & Houghton; *Literature and Life*, a second volume of Essays by E. P. Whipple (Osgood & Co.); a *Dictionary of English Synonymes*, and Synonymous or Parallel Expressions, by Richard Soule; *Among my Books*, a volume of literary Essays, published anonymously, by E. J. Hall & Son, but understood to be from the pen of Hon. W. B. Reed of Philadelphia; a new *Copious and Critical English-Latin Dictionary*, by Wm. Smith, LL. D., and Theophilus D. Hall, M. A.; a *Hand Book* of *Anglo-Saxon and Early English*, by Prof. Corson, of Cornell University; a *Hand-book* of *English Literature*, by Francis H. Underwood.

BRITISH.

Of theological works, we note Rev. Joseph M. Caul's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Of Historical and Biographical, *The History* of *France* from the earliest times to the year 1789, related for the rising generation by, M. Guizot, author of "The History of Civilization in Europe," translated from the French, and published in monthly parts; *History* of *the Christian Councils*, from the German of Dr. Hefele; Nicholas Pocock's compilation of *Records* of *the Reformation;* J. P. Gladstone's *Life and Travels* of *George Whitefield.* Of Scientific, Prof. Proctor's *Light Science for Leisure Hours*, being Magazine Articles revised. We observe that the

Life of Albert Barnes, *Three Score and Ten*, is republished in London. Murray Graham gives a *Historical View* of *Literature and Art* in Great Britain, from the accession of the House of Hanover to Victoria.

GERMAN.

Of the many theological works recently published in Germany, we can mention only a small numbsr.

Biblical.—The eighth edition of De Wette's Historico-critical Introduction to the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Testament has recently been published in Berlin. This edition is prepared by Dr. E. Schroder, Prof. of Theol. in Zürich, whose additions and various improvements are very extensive, and make it, in many respects, more like a new book than like the last edition, which De Wette himself revised twenty-five years ago.

The same house (George Reimer, Berlin,) has also published a new edition of Bleek's Introduction to the Old Testament, under the editorship of A. Kamphausen. Whilst both books are of great value for the critical study of the Sacred Scriptures, A. Kamphausen, with commendable impartiality, recommends, in a review of these books, that those who are unable to get both, get the former and not the one which he edits and has considerably improved.

For some time German critics have discussed the question, whether any of the Psalms were written as late as the Maccabean period? Hitzig, and others, contend that many of them were written at that time. The possibility that some of the Psalms were written as late as that, was already acknowledged by Calvin. Two small books have recently appeared on this subject, one by Carl Ehrt, Ph. D., and the other by D. P. Petersen. Both aim to prove that the book of Psalms was completed before the days of the Maccabees. The former regards the period of the restoration, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, as the time when the book was completed.

On the prophet Daniel, a number of works have lately been published. The commentary by the well-known Dr. and Prof. C. F. Keil, is of course conservative, and forms part of the Biblical Commentary on the O. T. prepared by Keil and Delitzsch, the greater part of which is now completed.

A popular work, intended as an introduction to the study of this prophet, emanates from the pen of Prof. C. P. Caspari. Shortly before these two books appeared, commentaries on Daniel were published by Dr. R. Kranichfeld and Rev. J. L. Füller; and the last one that has appeared which we here mention, is the commentary by Dr. O. Zöckler, Professor at Greifswald, which forms a part of Lange's Bibelwerk.

The literature on the New Testament, of recent date, which we notice, is as follows. Dr. E. Thomasius has written a practical commentary on Collossians, adapted specially for ministers. The concordance to the

Greek N. T., by O. Schmoller, is a valuable aid to the student of the Bible.

The work of Dr. K. Wieseler entitled: "Beiträge Zur richtigen Würdigung der Evangelien und der evanglischen Geschichte," deals with difficult questions connected with the gospels. The eminent scholarship of the author, and his study of these and related questions for many years, make the result of his investigations specially valuable.

Dr. F. Hitzig, Prof. of Theol. in the University of Heidelberg, has published a history of the Israelites, from their origin till the year 72 of our era. Prof. H. is an eminent oriental scholar, has published a number of works on the O. Testament, and belongs to the negative school of criticism.

Other Theological Works.—Dr. Julius Hamberger has edited a book entitled "The Light of History," consisting of extracts from the writings of Johannes von Müller's works.

Fetechism, by F. Schultze, Ph. D. "Ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie und Religious geschichte."

The Christian Doctrine of *Justification and Reconciliation*, by A. Ritschl. Only the first volume has appeared, which gives a history of the doctrine.

Leibnibtz and his Times, by Rev. L. Grote. A series of popular lectures.

Of a more scholarly character is the book of Dr. Edm. Pfleiderer—*Gotfried Wilhelm Leitnitz als Patriot, Staatsmann und Bildungstræger.*

The Augsburg Confession Historically and Exegetically Explained, by O. Zoeckler. The author's aim is to promote the union of all evangelical Christians of Germany on the basis of the Augsburg Confession.

The fifth volume of Rothe's "*Ethik*" has lately appeared, completing the entire work. This is the second edition; the first was sold long ago. The author, recently deceased, was Professor at Heidelberg, and was regarded as one of the deepest theologians of Germany. His Ethik is his most celebrated work, and was frequently asked for after all the copies of the first edition were sold. The second edition was revised by the author. The "*Dogmatik*," and several volumes of "*Sermons*," by the same author, have also been published lately.

The German Quarterlies.—*Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, edited by the following Drs., Liebner in Dresden, Dorner in Berlin, Ehrenfeuchter and Wagenmann in Göttingen, and Landerer, Palmer and Weizsäcker in Tübingen. Sixteenth volume, first number. Besides notices of new books, this Quarterly contains the following articles: "John Brenz as preacher and catechist, by Dr. Palmer." "The Proem of the Gospel of Luke, by Dr. Wilibald Grimm, Prof. of Theol. at Jena." "Schleiermacher's Doctrine of the feeling of Absolute Dependence, by Dr. Wm. Bender." In the first article Dr. Palmer calls attention to the fact that Brenz, as a preacher, has not received the consideration he deserves. He was much more mild in his sermons than Luther. In comparing himself

with Brenz, Luther says that his own spirit is like the wind, the earthquake and the fire, which rends the mountains and breaks in pieces the rocks, while that of Brenz is like the still small voice. Brenz stands higher as a catechist than as a preacher, and exerted great influence through his Minor and Major Catechisms, published in 1527 or 1528.

The second article contains a very learned explanation of the first four verses of Luke's Gospel. The last article is theological and philosophical. Schleirermacher makes the essence of religion consist in the feeling of absolute dependence on God. To understand Schleiermacher's system, which has exerted so great an influence on modern theology, it must first be determined what he means by this feeling of dependence. To determine this, and thus give the key to the entire system of S., is the aim of Dr. Bender. The investigation necessarily deals with psychology as well as theology. Religion being made to consist in a feeling, special attention is of course paid to man's religious nature, to the conditions of religion in the soul. And S.'s system is specially important because it lays so much stress on the psychological element in religion, which, before his day, had been too much neglected. S. himself gives us the best insight into his system, when he says that it was not so much his aim to teach men something new, as to make them conscious of what was already in them.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken—2d number, 1871. "The entrance of Jesus on His Messianic Mission. A contribution to the history of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus. By Erich Haupt." "The Song of Moses (Deut. 22) and the book of Deuteronomy. A contribution to the history of the origin of the Pentateuch. By Klostermann in Kiel." "Wycliffe and Huss, Reformers before the Reformation, and their relation to the scholastic systems of realism and nominalism. By Rev. L. Krummel." "On the Destroyer of Samaria. By A. H. Sayce, of Oxford."

Besides these articles, some fifty pages are devoted to the review of books.

"*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*—2d number, 1871. "Utraquists and Taborites. A contribution to the history of the reformation in Bohemia in the 15th century. By L. Krummel, pastor in Kirnbach, Baden." "Galatia and its first Christian congregations. By Dr. Sieffert, Königsberg."

The former of these articles, which is only the first of a series, gives an account of the origin of the parties mentioned, their points of agreement, their differences, and their conflicts. The article is the result of much research, and is an interesting and valuable contribution to the history of the Bohemian reformation, from 1415 till 1431. The entire series is to follow this history to the year 1457.

The burning of Huss was the immediate occasion of the organization of the Hussite parties known as Utraquists and Taborites, the former having their centre in Prague, the latter near Austi, on a hill called Tabor. Originally these parties were essentially one, and fought as one host against

the Papists. The one-eyed Ziska was their leader. Bravely they fought against fearful odds. In the very beginning of the war between the Hussites and the Papists, Ziska, with only four hundred men poorly armed, was unexpectedly confronted by five thousand royal troops, picked men, and well armed. After several hours of desperate fighting, the royal troops, having suffered greatly, were obliged to withdraw from the field. Sigismund, the Emperor of Germany, determined to annihilate the Hussites, and assembled an army of perhaps one hundred thousand men, in 1420. and marched against them. But, after several battles, he was compelled to leave Bohemia, his army being almost annihilated. Thus the whole of Bohemia, as well as Moravia, was held by the Hussites at the close of 1420.

We shall not follow the history of the Utraquists and Taborites further at present, but shall give the four articles of Prague, which give their fundamental principles. They were drawn up in 1420, and are as follows:

I. The Word of God shall be preached freely and without hindrance, and in an orderly manner, by the priests of the Lord in the kingdom of Bohemia.

II. The Sacrament of the holy Eucharist shall, according to the command and the institution of the Saviour, be freely given, under both forms of bread and wine, to all believers in Christ who are not excluded therefrom by mortal sin.

III. The clergy shall be deprived of the worldly dominion over earthly estates and riches, because it hinders them in the discharge of their duties and is detrimental to the secular authority; and they shall be brought back to the evangelical rule and to the apostolic life which Christ led with his disciples.

IV. All mortal sins, especially those that are public, and all other disorders which are against God's law, in whatsoever grades of society they may be found, shall be punished and destroyed in an orderly and rational manner by the proper officers.

These articles give a good idea of the doctrinal progress made by the Hussites one hundred years before the Lutheran Reformation. Krummel sees in them the germs of the doctrines which form the basis of Protestantism. But the hope excited by the favorable beginning of the reformation in Bohemia was not realized, chiefly because the Hussites quarreled among themselves. Their enemies used these dissensions for their own ends, and finally restored the Roman Catholic religion in Bohemia.

Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche. (Monthly). Edited by Drs. J. C. R. von Hofman, Henry Schmid, Fr. Frank, Professors of Theology in Erlangen, and Dr. Adolf von Scheurl, Prof. of Canon-law in Erlangen. 61st Vol. Numbers 1 and 2. 1871. This journal is of a much more popular character than the preceding quarterlies. Instead of learned articles for scholars only, it discusses living issues, in which all Christians are interested. In the first number an article, entitled "The new ways of God,"

views from a religious stand-point the Franco-Prussian war. And in another article the prevalent political maxims and morals are discussed. The second number opens with an article on Darwin's theory. In the second article, certain supposed evils in the Church are discussed. The first evil is the examination of candidates for the ministry in Latin. The questions and answers of these examinations are all in the Latin language; this custom, the author argues, should be abolished as a useless relic of the past, and the German language substituted. Even when the student uses his mother tongue, these examinations are hard enough; and the use of the Latin only adds unnecessary "torture." Another supposed evil is—too much preaching. "Indeed, there is entirely too much preaching; too much for the preacher, too much for the congregations." The preacher has not the time to prepare well the many sermons required, and the result is, that the people get sermons of a poorer quality than would be the case if the quantity were diminished. Though the Editors admit this article, they say, in a note, that in the main they do not agree with its contents. The last article discusses Apologetics and Christian Instruction. The names of the authors of the articles are not given.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Conservative Reformation and its Theology: as represented in the Augsburg Confession, and in the history and literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, By Charles P. Krauth, D. D. pp. 840.

This volume, for some time expected, has made its appearance. The publishers have done all that is necessary on their part. It is gotten out in a very attractive style, as to paper, printing, binding, etc. It is not very often that so large and attractive a volume, of a theological character, appears from the American Press.

Of the contents of the volume it would require a very extended notice to give any satisfactory view, as it covers quite a wide range of topics, and is somewhat miscellaneous in its character. A large part of the material of this volume has been before the public in other forms, and the author alludes to "what has been taken from his articles in Reviews, and in other periodicals." This does not at all detract from the real merit or paramount value of the volume, as many of the very best standard works have been thus produced; but it will detract somewhat from the interest which many might otherwise feel, and will in many cases, no doubt, as in our

own, cause a feeling of disappointment, when they expect to find an entirely new work. We are inclined to think that Dr. Krauth might have produced an original volume of more unity of design and execution, and that would have been of greater value to the Church.

However, we have not to do with what the author might have, but what he actually has done. In collecting, digesting, and adding to, his material, so as to give something of unity to the volume, the author tells us that, "the plan of this book is, in some respects, new. It aims at bringing under a single point of view what is usually scattered through different classes of books." The "contents" are arranged in the following order: A. The Conservative Reformation: I. Occasion and Cause; II. Chief Organ: Luther, III. Chief Instrument: Luther's New Testament. B. Church of the Conservative Reformation: Lutheran Church. C. Confessional Principle of the Conservative Reformation. D. Confession of the Conservative Reformation: I. Primary Confession: Augsburg Confession. II. Secondary Confessions: Book of Concord. E. History and doctrines of the Conservative Reformation; Mistakes Corrected. F. Specific Theology of the Conservative Reformation: I. Original Sin (Augsburg Confession, Art. II). II. Person of Christ (Augsburg Confession, Art. III.) III. Baptism (Augsburg Confession, Art. IX.) IV. Lord's Supper (Augsburg Confession, Art. X.) 1. Thetically stated; 2. Antithesis considered; 3. Objections answered.

It will be seen from this table of "Contents," that the volume covers only a very small part of the doctrinal articles even of the Augsburg Confession, and it has the appearance of being constructed to suit the material in hand, rather than to make such a volume as the title would suggest. The work bears very strong evidences of the process of its construction. A complete index to the whole volume greatly increases its value, and makes comparatively easy the work of reference to particular topics and facts.

Those familiar with the productions of Dr. Krauth's pen need hardly be told that the volume contains specimens of most vigorous and elaborate composition. Dr. K. seldom writes in a slovenly style, and much of this volume has the advantage of repeated revision. It would be easy to select examples of very forcible presentation of truth, but our space will not allow of this. The style of the author, in this volume, if open to censure at all, is too elaborate and artistic for such a subject. Sometimes our attention is drawn from the subject to the artist.

Some of the articles present exhibitions of keen analysis and complete exposure of "mistakes corrected." Dr. K. seem to delight in dissecting an error, and, we think, is often more happy in exposing a fallacy than in establishing a truth. He has well defended the Lutheran doctrine against divers false imputations. Some men who have undertaken to write about Lutheranism have not fared very well at his hands. Whilst treating the parties reviewed with "distinguished consideration," he has, with gentle

and sometimes honeyed words, used the dissecting knife to their serious discomfort.

The parts of this volume are very unequal in length and merit. It contains much that is very good, and some things, we think, not so very good. Parts of it might well have been spared, or the place supplied with something newer and fresher. After a Preface, elaborately written, and some twenty pages on the "Occasion and Cause" of the Reformation, we have sixty-six pages on Luther himself. This is very readable, and indeed interesting, but it hardly needs the testimony of so many witnesses to establish the fact that Luther was a very extraordinary man. All sound Lutherans will agree with our author in his conclusion, and would have given a verdict with one half the testimony. The article on "Luther's New Testament," is quite critical but rather dry. The article on the "Conservative Church, etc.," is carefully balanced, and presents the Lutheran Church in the very best aspect. We notice some promises not fulfilled. Page 132, following "Lord's Day," we read "an ample discussion of all the points here summarily presented will be found in their place in this volume." We have not been able to find any "ample discussion of the "*Lord's Day.*" Why was it omitted? In this article (IV.), Dr. K. has retained the same language he used ten years ago and before his conversion alluded to in the Preface, showing the substantial unity of Lutherans and other orthodox Churches even on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As he says: "In no case has a line been allowed to stand which does not express a present conviction," the hope may be entertained that he does not after all differ so widely from "the prevailing theology of our time and our land," or from the old friends, "who were most intimately associated with him."

The article on the "Confessional principle of the Conservative Reformation," has very much the air of a special plea for the General Council and its type of Lutheranism. It furnishes us with the "Fundamental Principles" of the General Council, Professor's oath in the Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Inaugural of Dr. K., etc. We hardly know on what principle it is, that in a volume of eight hundred and forty pages, on "the Conservative Reformation and its Theology as represented in the Augsburg Confession," we are treated to so much of the General Council and so little of the Augsburg Confession. We think it would have been well, and in accordance with the title, if the author had given more prominence to the Confession itself, and less to partizan views and uses of it. About the history of the Augsburg Confession something more will be said before the close of this notice.

The articles reviewing Drs. Shedd and Gerhard, are written in the author's best vein, and are very fine specimens of sharp criticism. From some points we might dissent, but we commend their sharpness and vigor. The article on Original Sin is a very full and thorough discussion of that subject. The articles on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, contain proba-

bly the most controverted points. The most that is presented on Baptism, all who approve of infant Baptism, will accept. Dr. K. has used more than twenty pages to disprove what, so far as we know, no one has ever maintained—that Luther was an immersionist, or that he taught the necessity of immersion in Baptism. His man of straw is very thoroughly demolished, and Dr. K. need not fear his ghost. About two hundred and fifty pages are devoted to a discussion of the Lord's Supper. Of this it may be said that it is one of the most elaborate discussions of the subject to be found in English, and presenting the best arguments that can be offered for the peculiar view advocated by the author. Whilst admitting the ability of the discussion, we think the learned and acute writer has failed to establish his theory.

We are disposed to accord to these separate discussions very decided merit. They exhibit the learning and ability of the author on the very points which he has selected as the chosen topics for the exercise of his powers. Gathered now into one volume, they will be more accessible to readers in and out of the Lutheran Church. We feel constrained, however, to take some exceptions to this volume, and to note serious defects and blemishes. There are some points that may hereafter claim attention in the Review. At present we advert to only a few things, which come within the province of such a notice.

1. The incongruity between the title, "*The Conservative Reformation and its Theology,*" and the general drift of the volume. The author does not attempt or wish to conceal the fact, that this work is published in the interest of what he *now* regards as genuine Lutheranism. That this Lutheranism is of the rigid or extreme type, as exhibited in the Formula of Concord, is equally manifest. The true *conservative* element in the great Reformation is ignored, and an extreme Lutheranism is baptized with the name. Poor Melanchthon, whose "great gifts" are admitted, is hardly allowed to pass as a sound Lutheran. "The Book of Concord,"—which is eulogized without stint—we are told, "treats Melanchthon as the Bible treats Solomon." These inspired Lutherans "draw the veil over the record of his sadder days." They do what Luther did not find it necessary to do, and make a poor apology for defaming his name, by exalting his talents and learning. Luther and Melanchthon were the complements of each other, and represent the true conservatism of the Reformation. This volume sympathizes with a party who, going beyond Luther and Melanchthon, make the great Reformation a sectarian movement. We object to calling this "*the Conservative Reformation,*" as it puts the Lutheran Church in a false light before the Christian world. There are millions, who unwilling to accept the author's exposition of Lutheranism, yet earnestly declare, "We too are Lutherans."

2. The very partial presentation of the "*Theology*" of the Reformation. A single fact will illustrate this. The readers of this volume will find over

three hundred pages devoted to the sacraments of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, while the extended Index contains but a single reference to the fundamental doctrine of *Justification;* and on turning to the place referred to, they will find the subject disposed of in one sentence of between five and six lines. It has been somewhat common to distinguish between the material and the formal principles of Protestantism, making the former, Justification by faith, the distinctive principle of Lutheran Protestantism, and the other, the Scriptures, of Reformed Protestantism. Luther's well known expression of Justification, as "articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ, shows in what estimation he held it. The ample discussion of the subject by Melanchthon in the Apology, witnesses to the same conviction. Any work on the Reformation that gives no prominence to this doctrine, overlooks the very point on which it hinges. We fear that our author has been so engrossed with the subject of the sacraments, that he has been led to regard them as the very heart and centre of the "*Conservative Reformation and its Theology.*" At least they occupy nearly half this volume of eight hundred and forty pages, and Justification is despatched in a few lines.

3. The unfair use made of authorities. We regret to be compelled to make this charge against this volume. From the statement contained in the Preface we should not expect to find so grave a fault. The author says of his book, p. xii.: "Its rule is, whether the views stated are accepted or rejected, to give them in the words of their authors. The citations from other languages are always translated, but when the original words have a disputed meaning, or a special force or importance, they are also quoted. The author has, as nearly as he was able, given to the book such an internal completeness as to render it unnecessary to refer to other works while reading it." How carefully and candidly this "rule" has been observed, one or two illustrations will show. On page 225, we find what purports to be Melanchthon's Letter of May 11th is so mutilated—without any hint of its being done—as to entirely change the meaning. Whole sentences are left out from the middle of the letter, and the parts brought into different relations from what they occupy in the original, and then used to prove what the letter itself would never suggest. As the reference to this letter is not given, we give it, Corpus Reformatorum, Vol. II. No. 685.

Pages 541, 542, our author gives what purports to be "the Liturgies of Luther and the Lutheran Church," on the mode of Baptism. After citing Luther's translation of the Romish Ritual, 1523, containing *tauchen*, and setting it aside as of no importance in the discussion, he refers to another revised form by Luther in the same year, which has *Ich tauf dich.* This he declares to be "*the only Ritual of Baptism which is Luther's exclusive work.*" He then passes on to 1529 and following. The unsuspecting reader would hardly believe that in 1526, between these dates, Luther prepared and published what is really his true Taufbüchlein, which was print-

ed along with his Catechism, included in the earlier and best editions of the Book of Concord, and published along with innumerable copies of the Catechism since that day. It is found in the Erlangen edition of Luther's works, pronounced by Dr. K. "the latest and most critical ever issued," p. 290. Müller gives it, p. 834. This Liturgy of Luther is found in the same volume, xxii. of the Erlangen edition, to which Dr. K. refers, and along with the ones of less value that he cites. But it has *tauchen* and did not suit the purpose.

We can hardly regard this as fair, or according to the profession made. Dr. K. might have cited this and still made out his case, that Luther did not teach the necessity of immersion, and in fairness he should have done so.

4. The special pleading on various points. We cannot refer to all of these, but select one as an illustration. Dr. K. seems determined to make out a strong case of Luther's part in the preparation of the Augsburg Confession. He transfers the whole of the lengthy argument on this subject from the Introduction to his edition of the Augsburg Confession, without taking the trouble, however, to correct an erroneous reference found in this volume, page 227. Vol. II. 680, of Corpus Reformatorum, should be Vol. II. 698. He undertakes to prove that the Confession was sent to Luther, and examined by him, *three times*, before its presentation. A more marked instance of special pleading it would be difficult to find. Without one single fact, well ascertained or undisputed, our author boldly maintains his position, and professes to "sweep away all necessity for further discussion on this point." We may admire his courage, but cannot say much of his candor or discretion. The argument turns upon Melanchthon's letter of May 22d, and the Preface to his Body of Christian Doctrine. If, as argued from Melancthon's letter, Luther actually received and examined again the Confession, why not give us some direct proof? The author is familiar with the documents of the time. Who took the Confession to Luther only three or four days after it had been returned the first time? What did Luther do to it, or with it? When was it returned? Where is the letter he wrote—if he wrote any? Not one word on such points. We have the documents in reference to the first sending of the Confession—the Elector and Melanchthon's letters, and Luther's reply. But not a syllable from Luther on this alleged second sending—and yet his letters have been carefully preserved and examined. The argument for the third sending is, if possible, still more feeble and forced. It is based on what Melanchthon says in the Preface to his Body of Christian Doctrine. "His words are, "in the presence of the Princes, and other officials, and of the preachers, it was discussed. * * The complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes that he had read the Confession and approved it." From this Dr. K. argues, "this is wholly distinct from Luther's indorsement of the Confession as sent May 11th, for that was not the "*tota forma*," but relatively

unfinished; that had not been discussed before the Princes, officials, and preachers, for they were not yet at Augsburg. * * Up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the only one of the Princes at Augsburg." This looks quite plausible, and would have some force were it not for the facts in the case, but unfortunately the facts are all against the argument. Dr. K. says that "up to May 11th, the Elector (with his suite) was the *only one* of the Princes at Augsburg." The words ("with his suite") in parenthesis are calculated, if not designed, to mislead the reader. That "*suite*" of the Elector really included a majority of the Princes who signed the Augsburg Confession, with the most distinguished "officials and preachers." As so much stress is laid on this point, we give some authorities to show what basis there is for the argument. Walch says that the Elector took with him, "his son, John Frederick, Francis, Duke of Luneburg, Wolfgang, Prince of Anhalt, and not to enumerate the counts, barons and other nobles, his theologians, Martin Luther, George Spalatin, Justus Jonas, Philip Melanchthon, and John Agricola, the last named being in the train of Albert, Count of Mansfield." Luther was left at Coburg. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer says (Ev. Rev., Vol. X., 488) the Elector was attended by an imposing retinue, consisting of numerous princes and noblemen." One would think, as the Elector's "*suite*" included a majority of the Princes, who actually signed the Confession, the most distinguished theologians and officials, with some seventy of the nobility, that Dr. K. would have had no difficulty in finding Princes enough to answer the purpose. The "*tota forma*" will not help him. "Tota" does not mean so much finished, completed, perfected, as whole, entire, referring rather to the entirety or totality of anything than to its completeness or perfection. Dr. K., indeed, denies his own argument in this very volume. He says, p. 336, "This Confession, *when finished*, was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom, without a solitary change, it was approved, May 15th, one month previous to the entrance of the Emperor into Augsburg." Here he makes this the "*finished*" Confession, which, in this special pleading, he says was "*not the tota forma*," but "*relatively unfinished*." We must leave him to reconcile his own contradiction. If Dr. K. will just produce that letter of Luther, written to the Princes, and show that it is different from that of May 15th, he will do more than he has yet done to "sweep away all necessity for any further discussion of this point." Meanwhile he stands alone in this view of the Confession being sent *three times* to Luther for his examination. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer says, Ev. Review, Vol. X., p. 486: "With the well-known answer of Luther, May 15th, which is given by all the writers before us, he returns the document, *which was the Augsburg Confession in its complete state*, stamped with the seal of his approbation. *He* evidently knows nothing of this second and third sending of the Confession to Luther.

Dr. K. undertakes to correct the "mistakes often made" about Calvin's subscribing the Augsburg Confession, and assures us that he "subscribed

the unaltered Augsburg Confession, and acted as a Lutheran minister under it." It is not a very vital point; and we think it would have done neither Calvin nor the Confession any harm, if he did. We regret that Dr. K. has not given us the data for this statement, so "as to render it unnecessary to refer to other works," for on referring to several learned authorities we find that they state the very opposite of what he has alleged.

There are other statements in the volume that will challenge discussion. We will only mention one more—the form of presenting the communicatio idiomatum, p. 316: "The "idiomata" are inseparable from the natura, the attributes are inseparable from the nature, and if there be a "communication" of natures, there must be a "communicatio" of the attributes; that is, the nature personally assumed must, in the assumption, be participant of the attributes of that nature to whose person it is assumed."

Our notice has already extended beyond our expectation, and we close with simply adding, the volume before us is characterized by the most striking merits and greatest weaknesses of the author.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST, by J. A. Reubelt, D. D., Prof. in Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., based on the German of W. F. Gess. Second edition, pp. 456. 1871.

This is a discussion of a most important subject. The question, "*What think ye of Christ?*" is the question for all time. The answer given to this question determines our theology.

The volume of Professor Reubelt is "based on the German of W. F. Gess." He says that when he "differs from the revered author, he has stated this in a note," but that "he has sometimes also modified the text, so that what is now offered, exhibits the translator's Christology." We are thus left in uncertainty, without a careful and continued comparison, precisely what belongs to Gess, and what to the translator. It would have been much more satisfactory if the translator had given us, in English, the work of Gess, without alteration, and presented in notes his own views, as in part is done. Appendices are added on "the history of the Dogma of the Incarnation," and "the Origin of the Human Soul"—the latter from Delitzsch.

The spirit of this book is reverent, and it is written in the interest of orthodox Christianity. The author, in the main, advocates the views, which have been received and accepted by the great body of the Christian Church in all ages. In five sections, he treats of "the Eternal Son of God—the Son upon earth—the Glorified Son of God—the Historical Development of the Son of God—the Incarnation of the Son, and the Trinity." By a full and careful analysis of scripture passages, we have proved the doctrine of the One Only and Eternally-Begotten Son of God, consubstantial with the Father; and by the Incarnation, in the one person, Jesus Christ, a truly human being, very man, as He was very God. The two natures, and the one person, in our Divine Redeemer, are maintained in

the most decisive manner. So far our author will receive the endorsement of those with whom he is identified in his general views.

But this is a book to be judged by its special character. We have plenty of profound treatises on the person of Christ, maintaining the two-fold nature in the one person. In this there is nothing new. It may be considered the common faith delivered to the saints. The distinguishing peculiarity of the volume—and on which it must stand or fall—is the distinct and earnest advocacy of what is called "*the self-emptying act of the Son of God.*" This view, which has had its advocates in former times, and more recently has been supported by Liebner, Thomasius and Hofmann, is warmly urged by our author. He alleges "that our American Christology needs reconstructing." We are not aware that we have any peculiar "*American Christology,*" and we think our author has undertaken a herculean and hopeless task.

We prefer allowing him to speak for himself, rather than to assume the responsibility of stating more fully his views. In speaking of "the Son's transition from his ante-mundane to his earthly state," there are such statements as follows: "The Scriptures do not, indeed, declare, in so many words, that the Logos, when he became incarnate, laid aside his self-consciousness; but consistently developing the scriptural doctrine of the incarnation we cannot but admit that he then divested himself also of his divine self-consciousness, in order to regain it by the gradual development of a human soul. This is, indeed, the only key to explain the real humanity of Christ. * * (p. 341) When the Logos sank into the slumber of unconsciousness, his eternal holiness, his omniscience, his omnipresence, and all his really divine attributes were gone * * p. 343. When the substance of the Logos awoke to consciousness in the infant Jesus, there awoke neither the remembrance of his eternal life with the Father, nor of the ocean of divine life, nor of his ante-mundane glory, p. 352. The eternal influx of life from the Father into the Son, by which he is the Son, took place from all eternity with the ante-mundane Logos, and is forever taking place with the glorified Jesus." p. 338.

There is much more of the same import, but these quotations will suffice to show the views advocated. The author is a *Kenoist,* and maintains a complete Kenosis, or self-emptying, of Christ during His earthly existence. He was divested of His divine attributes, in order to develop a distinct human nature, and human consciousness. He admits that this view is opposed to that commonly received, and maintains that the latter is chargeable with Nestorianism.

As the view under consideration professes to be "*scriptural,*" our appeal must be to the word of God. Do the Scriptures teach such a doctrine of the incarnation, and of the person of Christ? Do they teach that "the incarnation of the Logos was an act of self-divestiture—that the eternal Logos underwent a change in his incarnation, divesting himself of his divine form of existence and of his divine attributes?"

That the incarnation was a profound mystery, and that there was a hiding of the divine majesty and glory, we may safely admit. But that there was an actual laying aside, a "self-divestiture," of the divine attributes, we have failed to see the proof. That Christ really possessed these attributes during this very period of his humiliation, we think can be amply proved from the Scriptures.

In the accounts given us of the birth of Jesus thus much is implied. In Matthew, we read, quoted from Isaiah, "They shall call His name Immanuel—*God with us.*" In Luke, "That holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." At His very birth He received the most exalted homage and was worshiped as divine. His childhood has been pictured as "a kind of celestial flower." At twelve years of age He amazes the learned doctors of Jerusalem, and to the expostulations of His mother, speaks of being "about my Father's business." These words indicate His consciousness of His higher nature and sublime mission to our world. When He entered fully on His great mission, He spoke and acted as one profoundly conscious of superhuman authority and power. Can any one read such utterances as these—"I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world—He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven—I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me—and He that sent me is with me—I and my Father are one—he that hath seen me hath seen the Father—before Abraham was I am—as the Father knoweth me, even so hnow I the Father—I leave the world, and go to the Father—I lay down my life, that I might take it again. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again—I am the resurrection and the life—the Son quickeneth whom he will—that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father"—can any one read such utterances as these, and doubt whether Jesus was conscious of His divine nature?

He performed the most stupendous miracles, and gave power to His disciples to work like wonders. He acted under a full consciousness that there was no limit to His power and dominion. Not only "the wind and the sea obey Him," but "with authority and power He commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out." His wisdom was equal to His power. He could read men's hearts, foretel the future, and comprehend all the mysteries locked up in the universe of mind and matter. He "needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." "Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him." He was not limited in His divine nature, as in His human body, to a given locality. He said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." He spoke of Himself as "the Son of Man which is in heaven."

Surely all this, and ten-fold more that might be offered, does not look as if Christ, the Logos, "had laid aside His self-consciousness," and that "all his really divine attributes were gone." In Him "dwelt all the ful-

ness of the Godhead bodily." And, although while found in "fashion as a man," the divine glory was partially concealed, it shone through enough to lead John to say, and "we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." The beginning of maracles, in Cana of Galilee, "manifested forth *His* glory." On this Olshausen beautifully and truthfully remark: "The flesh in which the Logos appeared among men, is, as it were, a veiling of the light; but in the miracles the brightness breaks through the veil, and thus reveals the Divine light that is shut up in an unpretending form."

We do not enter upon any discussion of the doctrinal difficulties that beset the theory of the person of Christ defended in this volume. To our mind they are insuperable and destructive of all sound views of the nature of the Godhead, of the relations of the three persons in the Trinity, and of the work, as well as the person, of our Divine Redeemer. We would not by any means charge upon the author of this book the intentional maintenance of such errors, but we believe they are involved in the doctrine he advocates.

It may not be amiss to say that the common orthodox view of Christ's person does not seem to labor under the difficulties urged by our author. We cannot here enter upon a discussion of this subject. But we will, for the advantage of the general reader, present a brief statement from Liddon's Bampton Lectures, on the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. pp. 257, 260:

"The Church has not allowed her doctrine to be stated in terms which would dissolve the Redeemer into two distinct agents, and would so altogether forfeit the reality of redemption. But the question is whether the orthodox statement be really successful in avoiding the error which it deprecates. Certainly the Church does say that 'although Christ be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ.' But is this possible? How can Godhead and Manhood thus coalesce without forfeiture of that unity which is a condition of personality?

The answer to this question lies in the fact, upon which St. John insists with such prominence, that our Lord's Godhead is the seat of His Personality. The Son of Mary is not a distinct human person mysteriously linked with the Divine Nature of the Eternal Word. The Person of the Son of Mary is divine and eternal; It is none other than the Person of the Word. When He took upon Him to deliver man, the Eternal Word did not abhor the Virgin's womb. He clothed Himself with man's bodily and man's immaterial nature; He united it to His Own Divinty. He 'took man's Nature upon Him in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance, so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in One Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ.' Thus to speak of Christ as *a* Man, at least without explanation, may lead to a serious misconception; He is *the* Man, or rather He is Man. Christ's Manhood is not of Itself an individual being; It is not a seat and centre of personality; It has no conceivable existence apart from the act whereby the Eternal Word in becoming Incarnate called It into being and made It His Own. It is a vesture which He has folded around His Person; It is an instrument through which He places Himself in contact with men, and whereby He acts upon humanity. He wears It in

heaven, and thus robed in It He represents, He impersonates, He pleads for the race of beings to which It belongs. In saying that Christ 'took our nature upon Him,' we imply that His Person existed before, and that the Manhood which He assumed was Itself impersonal. Therefore He did not make Himself a 'double Being' by becoming incarnate. His Manhood no more impaired the unity of His Person than each human body, with its various organs and capacities, impairs the unity of that personal principle which is the centre and pivot of each separate human existence, and which has its seat within the soul of each one of us."

MEDIATION. THE FUNCTION OF THOUGHT. pp. 213.

This is an anonymous volume, and one about which, we confess that, we have no very definite opinion. It is fragmentary, or a "chapter of an unfinished work." We have neither the beginning nor the end, but what is styled "an intermediate statement." It is very difficult to feel the necessary interest in such a volume to give it a careful study. So far as we have examined it, we find nothing objectionable, and much that seems to point in the right direction. But we do not fully understand the author's intention. The title: "Mediation. The Function of Thought," has a degree of nebulosity about it, and the fragment offered does not remove it, or shed any very clear light. As a series of statements and definitions, it may serve to awaken thought, and this seems to us its chief value. We must leave the anonymous author to decide for himself, in regard to his contemplated work, "the question of devoting, from a busy life, the amount of time necessary to fill out the whole plan," or whether it "be worth while to develop it." He has reversed Horace's rule, and we must hold our judgment in abeyance.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.

CULTURE AND RELIGION, by Principal J. C. Shairp.

It is a very common notion, that earnest piety and profound learning are utterly irreconcilable. Some good men in every age have depreciated and denounced scholarly attainments, and many learned men have looked upon piety as the sign of a weak understanding. The sneering Voltaire said, Christianity is good enough for feeble intellects. "Goethe, the high-priest of culture, loathes Luther, the preacher of righteousness. And Luther, likely enough, had he seen Goethe, would have done him but scant justice." No doubt, godless learning has been a source of great evil to the world, but ignorant piety has spoiled some of the finest fruits of our holy religion. This book of Principal Shairp solves in an unusually clear and satisfactory manner the question of this seeming or supposed antagonism. He has done it in a way that commends itself to the good sense and sober judgment, not as the Scotch usually do, by "getting hold of the metaphysical end of a subject, and contriving to squeeze out whatever vital sap it contains."

The recognized apostles of culture at the present day are Prof. Huxley

and Matthew Arnold. The one stands as the representative of the large class of learned men devoted to science, the other is the earnest advocate of a *literary* culture, which is supposed to be an attainment beyond the reach of Christianity. The ideal of the *Scientific* theory is presented by Prof. Huxley, in a sentence of singular force and compactness: "That man, I think, has a liberal education, who has been so trained in youth, that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order; ready like a steam-engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of nature, and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself." This sentence rings grandly, and to the cold, isolated intellect presents an ideal that might inflame every part of the being. In language, the moral side of our nature is not ignored, but among the terms law, order and nature, we hear of such things as will, passion and conscience.

A fatal defect of this Scientific theory of culture is, it is out and out Godless. The ideal man has no element of religion proper in his being. He is imprisoned in an ice-palace of law, which is chilling to all high aspiration, and all lofty fellowship with Deity. "Men of keen and sensitive hearts would be overpowered with despondency, and would even loathe existence, did they suppose themselves under the mere operation of fixed laws, powerless to excite the pity or the attention of Him who appointed them." One of the first questions which a student would ask, under the inspiration of this ideal is, "Is it attainable? Can I expect any help from without to raise me up to it?" There is not a word of encouragement for weakness and helplessness. God is not only driven from the world which he has made, but the thought of superhuman energy to lift us up in our despondency has no place. One of the deepest questions of the heart about divine sympathy and divine help is left unanswered. A tender conscience, an obedient, vigorous will, a true, quick sense of right, are fine terms, but apart from the doctrine of a divine, quickening influence, they have no reality for such beings as we are. The instinctive cry of an earnest student in the presence of this scientific ideal of life is, "It is a mockery. It shows me heights of splendid achievement, but kindles no hope of reaching them."

This theory of life is radically defective from a scientific point of view. The man of right scientific spirit reverences all facts. His pride is the accuracy and thoroughness with which he collates, in the solution of his problems. But here are men inflaming young hearts with ideals of educa-

tion, with whom spiritual aspiration goes for nothing. Its doctrine of phenomenalism in mental science, bars the door opening to the noblest part of our being. Great facts in the moral world, are just as palpable as any thing in the crucible of the chemist, or under the glass of the Astronomer. The most important of all questions, that of right living, is solved by men who pride themselves on their scientific research, by leaving out of the calculation the most comprehensive of all ideas which can enter the human mind; for the great thought of God is the foundation of all right doctrine and all right conduct. It is almost like leaving out of view gravitation in studying the movements of the heavenly bodies. The last and deepest impression which this attractive theory of education leaves on the mind, is thus set forth by a vigorous thinker, in the London Spectator of July 30th: "The most dangerous form of unbelief at the present time is what may be called the scientific, which says, when it contents itself with negatives, 'we do not find God or any of the spiritual beings with which we have to do;' which goes further, when it chooses to be aggressive, and says, 'your theology is very much in the way of the improvement and advance of the human race, and we will put it out of the way.'" That we have done no injustice in representing the views of life as low and depressing, as exhibited by the most learned advocates of this kind of culture, the following elaborate illustration of Prof Huxley will abundantly confirm:

"It is a very plain and elementary truth that the life, the fortune, the happiness of every one of us, and more or less, of those connected with us, do depend on our knowing something of the rules of a game infinitely more difficult and complicated than chess. It is a game which has been played for untold ages, every man and woman of us being one of the two players in a game of his or her own. The chess-board is the world, the pieces are the phenomena of the universe, the rules of the game are what we call the laws of nature. The player on the other side is hidden from us. We know that his play is always fair, just and patient. To the man who plays well, the highest stakes are paid with that overflowing generosity with which the strong shows delight in strength. And one who plays ill is checkmated, without haste, but without remorse."

What a definition of education! It is learning the rules of a mighty game! It is little less than appalling to be told that the great end of all study is this. Those who have been trained in devout schools recoil from it as the worst kind of heresy in education—for all study is only learning "to play well," and all life, at its best estate, is only playing a game with one, who "never overlooks a mistake or makes the smallest allowance for ignorance." Such is scientific culture as set forth by its recognized representative. Its arrogant and pretentious claims, its brilliant ideals of virtue, its appearance of learning under the show of a formidable array of facts, may impose on many; but they who have had their training in a spiritual school, and themselves, with purged vision, have seen the King in His beauty, and the land that is "very far off," turn from it as something,

though in polished phrase, as false, and as dangerous as the blasphemies of Rosseau.

The theory of Matthew Arnold, which Principal Shairp fitly styles the *Literary* theory, though more plausible and more refined, is quite as faulty as that of Prof. Huxley. They both commit the same offence, the one directly, the other indirectly. The *Scientific* theory admits no place for the supernatural and the spiritual, the Literary recognizes that large world which "eye hath not seen," but assigns it a subordinate place in the work of education. It claims that culture is higher than religion. The chief end of man is to make the most of himself, and to this end religion will furnish help. "It seeks the best knowledge, the highest science that is to be had, it seeks them in order to make them tell on human life and character. To solve the question of human perfection, it consults the manifold human experience that has expressed itself in such diverse ways, throughout science, poetry, history, as well as through religion." This subordination of religion is just as fatal an objection, as though religion found no place whatever in the theory. In our thinking and living it must have the first place, or it has none at all. Its claims are first, unconditional and unqualified. Religion is everything or nothing. To give it a second place is equivalent to utter denial. But this theory of "making the most of one's powers and capacities," becomes in its deepest results intensely selfish. Its starting point is self, and the end is self. This one defect taints it in every part. If it even rises above the world to a God, and goes out beyond to the good of man, it does it because in some way it will aid in the development of our being. This cannot be a correct theory of human action. It cannot be dignified with the name of virtue. Dr. Newman's law of Ethics is aptly thus expressed:

"All virtue and goodness tend to make men powerful in this world; but they who aim at the power have not the virtue. Also virtue is its own reward, and brings with it the truest and highest pleasures; but they who cultivate it for the pleasure-sake are selfish, not religious, and will never gain the pleasure, because they never can have the virtue."

In the light then of this ethical principle, a principle which no one will question, they who live by the literary theory of culture, can lead neither virtuous or religious lives. Religion is annihilated by being made to occupy a subordinate place. and all supposed virtuous action is spoiled by constant self-reference. The highest mental and moral improvement must be begun from a different centre. The finest graces of human character ripen on a life consecrated to the good of man for the honor of God. "The highest capacities of which human nature is susceptible can be educed, only when culture ceases to be merely culture and passes over into religion. The spirit of man is an instrument which cannot give out its deepest, best tones, except under the immediate hand of the Divine Harmonist."

The author's statement of the possibility of combining in happiest harmony the highest culture with the most ardent piety, is clear and strong.

He has not a word to utter against the manliest scholarship, and the very highest attainments in knowledge and science, but he would have them crowned with a knowledge of the Crucified One. When thrown down at the foot of the cross, they fulfil their highest possible mission, and in that very consecration to the good of another is developed a royalty of character, compared with which the highest growth of mere scientific or literary culture is nothing. They who seek *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness shall have all other things given unto them.

"When religion has done its perfect work, it must lead on to culture. Culture and religion are not, when rightly regarded, two opposite powers, but they are as it were one line with two opposite poles. Start from the manward pole, and go along the line honestly and thoroughly, and you land in the divine one. Start from the divine pole, and carry out all that it implies, and you land in the manward pole, or the perfection of humanity. Ideally considered, culture must culminate in religion, and religion must expand into culture. When culture assumes its proper place, illumined by faith, and animated by devout aspiration, it acquires a dignity and depth, which of itself it cannot attain."

Though this train of remark may not give an adequate conception of the contents of this book, it is assuredly a work of more than ordinary interest. It has excited unusual attention among scholars, both in England and America, and is certainly one of those few books of which Lord Bacon speaks, "should be chewed and digested." Suggestive, marked by great purity of style, making it a model of correct English, in its clearness of conception often reminding us of the writings of Prof. Seely of Cambridge, more than all and above all, it is pervaded by a thoroughly evangelical spirit. The book itself is a happy illustration of the truth that the best literary and philosophical culture may be harmoniously blended with the simplest and most earnest Christian life, and that culture never appears so beautiful and so attractive, as when illumined with the spirit of true religion. E. F.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK,

Through Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM: A series of Lectures to the Times, on Natural Theology and Apologetics, By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D. pp. 369.

The author of this volume is so well known that he needs no introduction to our readers. His former publications—The Method of the Divine Government—Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation—The Intuitions of the Mind—Defence of Fundamental Truth—Academic Teaching in Europe—and Laws of Discursive Thought, have given him an established reputation in both hemispheres as a profound thinker and vigorous writer. The volume before us will not detract from his well-earned reputation.

The publishers have done their part so well as to leave nothing to be desired. It is a pleasure to handle and read such a volume, delightful to

the eye, as it is engaging to the mind. It contains ten lectures, delivered on the "Ely Foundation" of the Union Theological Seminary." These lectures are designed to meet the present state of scientific and philosophical doubt, and to defend Christianity against the most recent assaults of its enemies. They embrace three series—"Christianity and Physical Science"—"Christianity and Mental Science"—and "Christianity and Historical Investigation," to which are added three appendices—"Gaps in the Theory of Development"—"Darwin's Descent of Man"—and "Principles of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy."

It will be thus seen, at a glance, that Dr. McCosh plunges into the very midst of modern investigation and speculation, and does not shrink from grappling with the boasted and boastful giants of science and philosophy. He evinces throughout a full self-consciousness of his own powers, and of his ability to defend the citadel of Christianity against any and every foe. Nor is he slow in making sorties into the camp of the enemy, exposing their weaknesses, throwing them into confusion, and seeking to drive them from the field. Whatever fault any may find with the author's dealings with his opponents, none will accuse him with a want of courage, or a disposition to avoid a discussion of the great truths involved. He has met the opponents of Christianity and the Bible, foot to foot, and hand to hand, and refuses to yield a single inch of ground claimed by divine revelation.

These lectures are popular rather than scholastic, in form and style. Delivered before a promiscuous audience, the author has indulged his imagination as well as used his logic, aiming not only to convince, but to carry along with him, his hearers. We do not wonder that crowds of eager and interested listeners thronged the place of their delivery, for the lectures combine eloquent and glowing description, with scientific research and metaphysical acumen. We can hardly expect in such a volume the thorough and exhaustive analysis of certain subjects touched upon, that we find in "*Porter's* Human Intellect," or the careful and studied statements of *Fisher* in his "Supernatural Origin of Christianity." But our author will probably find more readers, for this very reason, than either Porter or Fisher, when treating some of the same points. If not so scholarly and careful, he is more popular and entertaining. He knows how to put a point so that it will tell.

Within the compass of book notices, it is hardly possible to give even a distinct outline of the field traversed in these lectures. The First Series deals with "Christianity and Physical Science," in which it is shown "that the argument from design is not undermined by modern discoveries"—that "Natural Selection," even if granted, does not account for the origin life, or dispense with the necessity of an intelligent personal agent as the Author of life and order in the universe, and that there is abundant evidence of powers at work above those of mere physical nature, clearly proving, what Cudworth has called, the "Intellectual System" of the

universe—or something more than Positivism with its material appearances.

In the Second Series, the real substantive existence of Mind is argued, and the Mental Principles exhibited, which are involved in the Theistic Argument. Rationalism and Positivism are canvassed and their weakness shown. No form of Materialism, however refined, will meet the demands of a true and sound philosophy. In these Lectures, "*Free Thought in America*" and "*Boston Theolgy*" come in for their share of attention. His critical survey of Materialism is concluded with a few distinct propositions, well sustained. "1. There is the Consciousness of the Personality and the Unity of the Mind. 2. The Mind follows laws of its own, which are not laws of matter. 3. Mind cannot be shown to be one of the correlated physical forces."

In the Third Series, Renan's *romance*, called Life of Jesus, and the Legendary and Mythic Theories of Christianity are disposed of, and the true historical character of Christ and His religion vindicated. Christianity is shown to be from God, and to be the great regenerating and subduing power in the world.

The Appendices touch the specific points named above, and exhibit the insuperable difficulties attending these latest attempts to substitute a "science falsely so called," instead of an enlarged sound philosophy and "the truth as it is in Jesus." The "*Gaps*" which Positivism leaves open are many and very great. One must feel, as he reads, how unsatisfactory is this pretentious philosophy, and how infinitesimally small is the range of its investigations. Verily,

> "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

If any fault is found with Dr. McCosh, and this volume—and it is not faultless—in will probably be with what seems like an over weening confidence in his own powers, and in a somewhat pedantic style occasionally indulged. The Doctor very justly lays great stress on self-consciousness in philosophy, and he does not lose his own, when contending for the faith. We can readily pardon some display of this last infirmity of great minds. Before a popular audience, and for popular reading, the frequent use of qua, when the English would answer just as well, sounds and looks pedantic. But we have no disposition to criticise the manner or style of the book. We are pleased with its contents, and believe the distinguished author has done a good service to the cause of truth and religion.

We cannot but rejoice at the number of able works which modern skepticism is calling forth, and feel assured, that as the Deism of the last century gave rise to the ablest historical defences of Christianity, so now, will modern doubt and speculation only lead to a fuller and more triumphant vindication of Christ and His religion. With such a conviction we greet this new volume of Dr. McCosh with pleasure, and commend it to all, as

worthy of a careful perusal, and well calculated to confirm faith, remove doubts, and strengthen in the great conflict between ever changing error and eternal truth.

Fresh Leaves in the Book and its Story, By L. N. R., Author of the "Book and its Story," "Missing Link," "Life Work," etc. pp. 500.

This is another of Carter's admirable publications. It is a fitting companion to the "Book and its Story," and will greatly aid in the intelligent and attractive reading of the Bible. It is not designed for the learned, and yet many, reckoned in that class, will find much in this volume to interest and instruct. It contains "some thoughts and facts about each of the books" in the sacred record, and very often furnishes just such information as many readers desire and feel they need. The hope is expressed that "it may be found useful in Sunday-schools and Bible-classes, and to young people in general," of which there can be no doubt, if they will only use it. Any who will read it along with the Bible will find instruction and profit.

The volume is very fully illustrated, adding greatly to its value, as these illustrations are not merely to attract attention, or show off the book, but serve the aim the writer has in view—"to convey information, in a clear and simple way, which in these days every Bible reader should possess." Of these illustrations, numbering more than fifty, some present views not accessible to every reader, including places, inscriptions, ancient alphabets, manuscripts, etc., etc. We notice that the paging of the illustrations, and the index, do not correspond. In brief, we have here collected and presented a vast amount of most interesting and valuable material, serving to explain and illustrate the inspired volume. Indirectly, too, it proves that *the Book*, with its "old, old story, of Jesus and His love," never wearies or grows old.

Ashcliffe Hall, By Emily Sarah Holt, author of "Mistress Margery," "Sister Rose," etc. pp. 443.

This is a tale of the last century, containing allusions to some prominent characters of that age, including Sacheverell and the Duke of Marlborough. "Ashcliffe Hall" is on the road from Exeter to Moreton Hampstead, and is the scene of this interesting and varied story. A strong religious vein runs through the whole, and it is intended to impress the value of eternal things compared with "the world that passeth away."

Harry and His Pony, By the author of "Little Kitty's Library." pp. 180.

This small volume is another of the "Fire Side Library," made up of short stories, with illustrations in cuts, and well calculated to impress good moral lessons on the young.

True to His Flag, By the author of the "Golden-Ladder" series, "Little Katy and Jolly Jim," etc. pp. 184.

One of the "Drayton Hall Series," and well worthy of its place. In the well written story of the trials of a young Christian, it it beautifully illus-

trates the strength and victory of Christ's grace. It is an excellent book for the young.

THE LESTRANGE FAMILY; a True Story, By Margaret E. Wilmer. pp. 214.

This interesting little volume sets forth the power and value of family religion and a careful training of the young in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. What the Church and society need, is Christian homes, pervaded by the truth and life of Christ. Home, and home piety, are not receiving their proper attention, in the rush and show of American life. We want books of this sort.

AGATE STORIES. By the author of the "Basket of Flowers." pp. 415.

Ten stories are embraced in this volume. They present interesting and striking pictures of God's providential care and love, and teach the lessons of obedience and trust.

DORA'S MOTTO: "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous." By Joanna H. Mathews, author of the "Bessie Books" and the "Flowerets." pp. 237.

This small book, one of the "Little Sunbeams," will delight the children and do them good. In teaching its beautiful lesson of courtesy and kindness, it wiil bless the homes it enters.

FAITHFUL ROVER, and other Stories; by the author of "Little Kitty's Library," "Dolly's Christmas Chickens," "Maggie and the Sparrows," etc. pp. 174.

THREE LITTLE SISTERS, by Emma Marshall, author of "Katie's Work," "Little Primrose," "The Little Peat-Cutters," etc. pp. 180.

Belong to the "Fire-side Library" series. In pleasing and instructing the children, these and similar little volumes fulfil a great service.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

THE GENESIS OF SPECIES, by St. George Mivart, F. R. S. With numerous Illustrations. pp. 296. 1871.

This is one of the numerous volumes called forth by the speculations of the Darwinian school, and which is entitled to the highest consideration. The author is acknowledged to be a naturalist of the very best attainments, and to have treated his subject with great impartiality and candor. It is refreshing to find a book on this now exciting question so free from partisan prejudice, and so devoid of the rancor which bigotry begets. There has been a great deal of acrimonious controversy over what professes to be questions of science, and this very fact creates distrust in the views of the parties concerned. It has been very common with scientific men, or men claiming to be scientific, to attempt to silence all opposition to their views, from certain quarters, by an appeal to the *odium theologicum*, but our author recognizes the unfairness of this, and the equal proneness to an opposite spirit. He says, speaking of Darwin's theory of "Natural Selection," "If the odium theologicum has inspired some of its opponents, it is undeniable that the odium *antitheologicum* has possesed not a few of its sup-

porters." It is time that it should be understood that the men who are opposed to the old fashioned Bible views of creation, and of the origin of man, have not a monopoly of candor and knowledge, and this volume will do a good service in helping to correct such false impressions.

We will endeavor to give a brief account of the design and scope of the book. The author recognizes the difficulties attending "the great problem concerning the origin of different kinds of animals and plants," and expresses the hope that some advance may be making towards "as satisfactory a solution as it can well have." He admits to some extent, at least, the theory of "Natural Selection," but does not regard it as excluding a creation by divine power. He states, and illustrates at length, the difficulties in the way of receiving "Natural Selection" as "the one explanation of the origin of species." We cannot do better than to present entire his condensed summary of these difficulties.

"That 'Natural Selection' is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures.

"That it does not harmonize with the co-existence of closely similar structures of diverse origin.

"That there are grounds for thinking that specific differences may be developed suddenly instead of gradually.

"That the opinion that species have definite though very different limits to their variability is still tenable.

"That certain fossil transitional forms are absent, which might have been expected to be present.

"That some facts of geographical distribution supplement other difficulties.

"That the objection drawn from the physiological difference between "species" and "races" still exists unrefuted.

"That there are many remarkable phenomena in organic forms upon which "Natural Selection" throws no light whatever, but the explanations of which, if they could be attained, might throw light upon specific origination." p. 21.

Whether each and every one of these difficulties be insuperable or not, we not attempt to determine. It is enough for us to know that an accomplished naturalist finds these objections to Darwin's easy method of explaining mysteries in creation. He tells us that he was "by no means disposed originally to dissent from the theory of 'Natural Selection,' if only its difficulties could be solved," but "he has found each successive year that deeper consideration and more careful examination have more and more brought home to him the inadequacy of Mr. Darwin's theory. * *" The "improbability" of some of his assumptions is "so extreme as to be practically equal to impossibility." It is not possible for us, for want of space, to present any of the facts or illustrations furnished by our author in support of his positions.

Darwin and his school are confronted by Mr. Mivart in the field of

ethics. He need have offered no apology for entering this field, "as somewhat remote from the question of the Genesis of Species." It is refreshing to meet a distinguished naturalist with broad and liberal views, who can rise above the prejudices too common to men devoted to the study of material subjects, and who can recognize the value of mind and morals as well as that of matter. The disciples of Darwin seem ambitious to explain all the problems in morality by "Natural Selection" and "Evolution." They claim a common origin for our ideas of right and wrong, and our sense of moral obligation, with that of our sensations of pleasure and pain. To the views of J. Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Darwin and others on this point, our author says, "We may safely affirm—

"1. That 'Natural Selection,' could not have produced, from the sensations of pleasures and pain experienced by brutes, a higher degree of morality than was useful; therefore it could have produced any amount of 'beneficial habits,' but not abhorrence of certain acts as impure and sinful.

"2. That it could not have developed that high esteem for acts of care and tenderness to the aged and infirm which actually exists, but would rather have perpetuated certain low social conditions which obtain in some savage localities.

"3. That it could not have evolved from ape sensations the noble virtue of a Marcus Aurelius, or the loving but manly devotion of a St. Lewis.

"4. That, alone, it could not have given rise to the maxim *fiat justitia, ruat cœlum.*

"5. That the interval between material and formal morality is one altogether beyond its power to traverse.

"Also, that the anticipatory character of moral principles is a fatal bar to that explanation of their origin which is offered to us by Mr. Herbert Spencer. And, finally, that the solution of that origin proposed recently by Sir John Lubbock is a mere version of simple utilitarianism, appealing to the pleasure or safety of the individual, and therefore utterly incapable of solving the riddle it attacks."

The "Evolution" and "Natural Selection," admitted and maintained by our author, are held to be in entire harmony with the teaching of revelation. He distinguishes between a "primary" and "derivative" creation, and argues in favor of both. He recognizes God as the original and efficient Cause of all things, but supports the view of successive "derivative" creations as the result of forces in nature, established and guided by infinite wisdom and power. His "Evolution" and "Natural Selection" are simply the unfolding of the divine plan in creation, or, "that the preceding matter has been created with the potentiality to evolve from it, under suitable conditions, all the various forms it subsequently assumes. And this power having been conferred by God in the first instance, and those laws and powers having been instituted by Him, through the action of which the suitable conditions are supplied, He is said in this lower

sense to create such various subsequent forms. This is the *natural* action of God in the physical world, as distinguished from the direct, or, as it may be here called, supernatural action." He says, "If such really be the direction in which physical science, philosophically considered, points; if intelligence may thus be seen to preside over the evolution of each system of worlds and the unfolding of every blade of grass—this grand result harmonizes, indeed, with the teachings of faith, that God acts and concurs, in the natural order, with those laws of the material universe which were not only instituted by His will, but are sustained by His concurrence; and we are thus enabled to discern in the natural order, however darkly, the Divine Author of nature—Him in whom 'we live, and move, and have our being.' " This is something quite different from Darwin's "Natural Selections" and "Evolution," and his view of God as the great First Cause, is quite different from the unknown something which Darwin opposes, and which in this book is well styled "the dummy, helpless and deformed, set up merely for the purpose of being knocked down."

It may be that Mr. Mivart is willing to carry the doctrine of evolution too far, and he certainly goes farther than we should like to follow, when he shows a disposition, in his love for "the orderly evolution and successive manifestation of specific forms by ordinary natural law," to include amongst such the upright frame, the ready hand, and the massive brain of man himself." Still his general theory is perfectly consistent with a genuine theism, and his view of creation has been considered orthodox and scriptural, having the suffrage of great names in the Church, in ancient as well as in modern times. To mention a single eminent scholar and critic of our own land, Tayler Lewis in his "Six Days of Creation," says: "A development theory which has no divine origination, or acknowledges the going forth in time of no Divine Word, is indeed atheism. * * But a development theory in the sense of species from species, as well as of individual from individual, may be as pious as any other. It may have as many Divine interpositions as any other. It may be regarded as a method of God's working, and that, too, as rationally and as reverently as the more limited system to which we give the name of nature in its ordinary or more limited sense. Modern theologians have been too much frightened by certain assumptions and speculations on this field."

Without endorsing everything in this volume, or pretending to decide intricate and perplexing questions of physical science, which have not been our special study, we heartily commend this interesting and learned work to those who are pursuing such investigations, and as eminently calculated to check the rash conclusions to which some are ready to leap. Its tone is moderate, its spirit candid, and the whole work pervaded by that humility which is as truly characteristic of genuine philosophy as it is of genuine religion. He tells us in closing this discussion on the "Genesis of Species:" "The aim has been to support the doctrine that these species have been evolved by ordinary *natural laws* (for the most part un-

known) controlled by the *subordinate* action of 'Natural Selection,' and at the same time to remind some that there is and can be absolutely nothing in physical science which forbids them to regard those natural laws as acting with the divine concurrence and in obedience to a creative fiat originally imposed on the primeval Cosmos, 'in the beginning,' by its Creator, its Upholder, and its Lord."

A. D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

THE TIMES OF DANIEL, an Argument, By Henry W. Taylor, LL. D., Late a Justice of the Supreme Court and Judge of the Court of Appeals of New York. pp. 208.

This volume, of moderate size, is gotten out in the usually neat style of this house. The author, a learned jurist, has found time to devote to the study of prophecy, which so many have found to be all obsorbing. He lays no claim to profound biblical scholarship, and the work gives no evidence of any exegetical ability. Indeed there is no evidence of any acquaintance with the best critics and commentators, who have undertaken to discuss the book of Daniel. The author is pretty free from the dogmatism which too often disfigures writers of his school. He claims a new theory of the plan of the book of Daniel, making "the first six chapters relate to matters entirely distinct from those which are revealed in the last six." It is with the last alone that the author deals. He "assumes that the last six chapters of Daniel relate to, and only to, the Christian dispensation," * * and thinks "the prophecy becomes a symmetrical and almost perfect photograph of the trials, successes, discouragements, persecutions and final victory of God's people." He fixes the time of the "blessed consummation"—the universal reign of Christ on the earth—"in or about the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-two."

Whilst we commend the author's reverent study of the Bible, and the moderate, Christian tone of the volume, we do not think he has thrown any new light on the "the Times of Daniel," or opened the meaning of "the words closed up and sealed till the time of the end."

GOD'S RESCUES: or the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son, By William R. Williams. pp. 95. 1871.

The name of Dr. Williams, to any work, is a sufficient guarantee that it is no common-place or ordinary production. Whatever he writes is elaborately finished, and at once commands attention by its matured thought and polished style.

The small volume before us possesses the substantial merits of the other writings of the learned author. He has selected three of our Lord's Parables, and made them the basis of three rich and stirring discourses. "*God's Rescues*" fitly sets forth the tender and touching themes, in which "the work of the Son, of the Spirit, and of the Father, in setting up the kingdom of God in the heart," is delineated.

To describe these discourses would be to quote a large part of them. In presenting the great evangelical truths of the Gospel we have many graphic pictures, and the characters stand before us as living realities. The ruined condition of the sinner, the tender, self-sacrificing love of Jesus, the purifying and sanctifying work of the Spirit, the compassionate love and infinite mercy of the Father, are set before us in the most impressive manner. They are full of tender love and gentle pleading. Such discourses must do good. No one can read them without being made to feel.

It is needless to say that Dr. W. does not design giving us a systematic treatise on the work of the Triune God in accomplishing our redemption. It is the very farthest removed from a dry and formal statement. But it will help to convey to the thoughtful reader some idea of the wonder-workings of divine grace in rescuing and restoring the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son.

Indirectly the author meets some of the current objections to the Bible doctrine of redemption. We give a single quotation. "The tininess of our planet, it may be, is not preventing it from serving as the great battle-field of God's moral universe. How oft a spot of military encounter, itself not larger than one of the city wards, may yet in our recent national struggle, have decided, by the battle there fought, the political destinies of the broad continent. So it is in God's government of our world and race. On our small nook of a globe, may yet gather and centre all the solicitudes of Heaven, and all the fierce hopes of Hell. Good and evil may come here into one long, and dread death grapple."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Dispositionen über Die Bergpredigt, u. s. w. pp. 48. 1871.

This small volume, printed at the office of the *Kirchenfreund*, and published by Rev. B. Pick, pastor of the German United Evangelical Church of St. Peter's, Syracuse, N. Y., is a collection of skeletons on the Sermon on the Mount, with special regard to the different pericope-systems. It can be had by addressing the publisher or Rev. J. D. Severinghaus, Oswego, N. Y.

The American Educational Monthly.

The numbers of this journal reach us regularly, and we commend it as interesting and valuable in the cause to which it is devoted. Published by J. W. Schermerhorn & Co., 14 Bond St. N. Y.

Luther's Preface to Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with an Introduction. pp. 16.

T. N. Kurtz, Baltimore, Md., has brought out a neat edition, in tract form, of this production of the great Reformer.

Erratum—On page 458, fourth line from bottom, for *paramount*, read *permanent*.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

Article. Page.

I. France and the Allied Powers at Waterloo,... 325
By Prof. E. Ferrier, of Pennsylvania College.

II. Strange Fire Worshipers,..... 343
By Rev. R. A. Fink, A. M., Johnstown, Pa.

III. The Spirit of the Age,..... 365
By Rev. Joel Swartz, D. D., Carlisle, Pa.,

IV. Education, its Aims and Results,..... 384
By Rev. W. M. Baum, D. D., York, Pa.

V. The Pulpit,..... 396
By Rev. Thomas Guthrie, Edinburgh, Scotland.

VI. The German Empire,..... 413
By Rev. J. D. Severinghaus, A. M., Oswego, N. Y.

VII. Church-Love among our People,..... 434
By Rev. G. Diehl, D. D., Frederick, Md.

VIII. Female Education,..... 445
By Rev. Prof. P. M. Bikle, A. M., Lutherville, Md.

IX. Literary Intelligence,..... 451

X. Notices of New Books,..... 458

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—General Literature.

BRITISH.

Biblical and Theological—Biographical and Historical.

GERMAN.

Biblical—Other Theological Works.

THE GERMAN QUARTERLIES.

"Jarbücher für Deutsche Theologie"—"Theologische Studien und Kritiken"—"Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie"—"Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche."

NEW BOOKS.

The Conservative Reformation and its Theology—The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ — Mediation: The Function of Thought—Culture and Religion—Christianity and Positivism—Fresh leaves in the Book and its Story—Ashcliffe Hall—Harry and His Pony—The Lestrange Family—Agate Stories—Dora's Motto—Faithful Rover—Three Little Sisters—The Genesis of Species—The Times of Daniel—God's Rescues—Dispositionen über Die Bergpredigt—The American Educational Monthly—Luther's Preface to Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1871.

ARTICLE I.

NEW OBEDIENCE.

ARTICLE SIXTH OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.*

By Rev. Charles A. Stork, Baltimore, Md.

It is not necessary, in order to vindicate the excellence of the Augsburg Confession as a standard of Christian faith, that it should be shown to be a symmetrical system of doctrine. Enthusiasts have professed to find in it such a system. But the attempts to make this symmetry apparent have not persuaded the unbiased that it has any existence, outside the minds of indiscreet admirers. The Confession was not shaped under such circumstances, nor by such aims, as must conspire in order to elaborate completeness. Systems of speculative truth come to perfection, as the particles of matter organize into the flawless crystal, in a state of absolute quiescence.

*Sixth Lecture on the Holman Foundation in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, delivered June 26th, 1871, at Gettysburg, Pa.

But the history of the Confession is the history of the resolution of two antagonistic forces. The Confession, as has been well said, was properly an apology. It represented the compromise—perhaps an unconscious compromise, yet still a compromise—made by those who stood between two mighty forces; on the one hand the attracting power of the Romish Church, combining in itself all the subtle force of association, habit, traditionary reverence, and desire for peace, and, on the other, the repelling power of truth, simple and absolute, working through minds enlightened and constrained by the word of God. They who framed it had no mind to draw out a perfect scheme of Christian doctrine. They had in view a practical purpose. That purpose involved the harmony of two conflicting aims, viz: to bring into strong relief the cardinal truths of the catholic faith in which they were cordially at one with the Romish Church, and yet to emphasize the specially evangelical doctrines wherein they felt themselves compelled to bear testimony to the unadulterated gospel of Christ, as against vital errors in that Church. These two points were to be kept in view, as the landmarks of the course down which they had to steer their difficult way.

The shaping of such a scheme of doctrine, would naturally enough result in anything but a symmetrical standard of faith. It was an attempt to do that in the sphere of theology, which has been realized in the sphere of political science in the growth of that anomalous but very useful thing, the English Constitution. Take away the history of the struggle that preceded and attended the formation of the Confession, and the first feature in it that will strike a candid mind, is its lack of symmetry. Read it in the light of the aims and hopes of its framers, and it is at once seen to be a work of matchless skill. As a purely logical statement of Christian doctrine, it is crude in form. As a practical testimony to the essential truths of the gospel, as over against the errors and perversions of Rome, it is a perfect organization. Read in this light, its abrupt transitions, as in the passage from the Article on Justification to that on the Ministry, are masterstrokes of strategy; its redundancies, as in the case of Arti-

cles VI. and XX., are the necessary defences of the Reformed position. It is in this light continually that the connection of the several articles, and the force of each separate article, must be estimated.

There is, for instance, no logical connection, viewed purely in the light of theological science, between the Article on "The Ministerial Office" and that on "New Obedience." But when we remember, that one of the strong fortresses of the Papal Church was the asserted power of the clergy to open and to shut the gate of heaven to men, and that linked to it in strategic order, stood that other dogmatic fortress of the fiction of the saints' merits vested in the clergy, with full powers to bestow on others as part of the purchase of salvation, then the connection of the Article, that strips the ministry of all powers of salvation, with that which relegates "good works" to their true position, as the fruits of faith and not the price of salvation, is evident enough.

In this light of history, we shall attempt to open the meaning of this Sixth Article of the Augsburg Confession, "concerning New Obedience."

The Article reads as follows:*

"They likewise teach, that this faith must bring forth good fruits; and that it is our duty to perform those good works, which God has commanded, because it is his will, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before him. For, remission of sins and justification are secured by faith;

---

*The translation of the Article given above is that of the "Book of Worship" as rendered from the Latin, a copy of which is subjoined from Müller's Edition of the Symbolical Books, 1860.

ART. VI. DE NOVA OBEDIENTIA.

Item docent, quod *fides illa debeat bonos fructus parere*, et quod oporteat bona opera mandata a Deo facere propter voluntatem Dei, non ut confidamus per ea opera justificationem coram Deo mereri. Nam remissio peccatorum et justificatio fide apprehenditur, sicut testatur et vox Christi: *Quum feceritis hæc omnia, dicite, servi inutiles sumus.* Idem docent et veteres scriptores ecclesiastici. Ambrosius enim inquit: Hoc constitutum est a Deo, ut qui credit in Christum, salvus sit, sine opere, sola fide, gratis accipiens remissionem peccatorum.

as the declaration of Christ testifies: 'When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants.'

The same thing is taught by the ancient ecclesiastical writers: for Ambrose says, 'This has been ordained by God, that he who believes in Christ shall be saved without works, receiving remission of sins gratuitously through faith alone.' "*

The doctrine of the Article is that of the vital connection of faith and holiness of life: it is a reaffirmation of that irrefragable chain which the apostle James forged out in his declaration that "faith without works is dead." In its connection, as part of the Confession, it grows logically out of Article IV. on Justification. In that Article was affirmed the Pauline doctrine, that the sinner is made just before God and acknowledged as his child freely through faith, without reference either to his outward works or to his inward affections. On this, after the somewhat illogical interpolation of Article V., on the "Ministerial Office," followed in most natural sequence the necessary complement and completion of the doctrine of faith, that it must be a living faith working by love and bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit. "They likewise teach that this faith must bring forth good fruits." That sentence contains the logical kernel of the whole Article; the rest is but the expansion and adjustment of the central thought.

We will examine first this central truth, and then the qualifications by which it is defined and guarded. This order of discussion involves the consideration of the following points:

---

*We may remark briefly, that the authority quoted, by the authors of the Confession, from the Fathers, is unhappily invalidated by a mistake. "The ancient ecclesiastical writers" give abundant testimony to substantiate the doctrine emphasized in this part of the article, (see the citations in Chemnitz, Quenstedt, Gerhard in loc, et passim); but Ambrose is not the author of the passage ascribed to him. It is found in a commentary on the Pauline Epistles attributed to Ambrose, but which a more careful criticism has decided not to be the work of this Father. Others have attributed it to the deacon Hilary. Its origin, though certainly patristic, is left, as to its particular sources, wholly in doubt. See Walch: *Introductio in Libros Symbolicos*, pp. 276—279.

1. The Necessity of the New Obedience.
2. The Nature and Limitations of it.
3. The Grounds of its Obligation.

First, then, in order of importance we have to consider

I. THE NECESSITY OF THE NEW OBEDIENCE.

The really salient feature of this Article, is the stress laid on the *necessity* of "good works." "This faith *must* bring forth good fruits;" "it is *our duty* to perform those good works which God has commanded." This affirms the necessity of right living. It affirms, too, the necessity of right living as an essential constituent or outflow of true religion. It makes holiness of life, conformity to the law of rectitude, to be bound up in the same necessity with the exercise of faith. It puts the obligation to good works into the same category with the obligation to worship and to trust in God. It unites what the common tendency of the religions of the world has almost uniformly separated, the religious sentiment, and the moral sense. The two may be, and are to be, distinguished, but not dissevered. We are under an obligation, felt by the rudest savage, to adore God. We are moved by a like potent sense of obligation to obey the law of right in the practice of life. But whilst neither is ever wholly extinguished, yet in the experience of the race there comes continually into view a rift between the two, tending ever to wider and wider division. In the pagan religions this is very marked. The code of religion there, is one thing: the code of morals, is altogether another. In the grosser forms of paganism they become directly antagonistic; as where the religious sentiment of the Hindoo mother moves her to kill her child; as in the worship of the Grecian Aphrodite in Asia Minor, where a part of the cultus was the practice of unchastity. But, as religion becomes purified by right reason, this chasm is made narrower, until in the revelation of truth given in Christianity the separation is wholly lost, and the connection between religion and good morals, between faith and works, is made so close that they are bound up with the same cord of obligation. They are enclosed in the same ne-

cessity, and enforced by the same sanction of conscience and command. At last the religious sentiment and the moral sense merge wholly into each other, and become one in that peculiarly spiritual quality of the soul, for which pagan langauges, indeed, furnish no adequate term, but which we know by the name of *holiness.** In that are blended and lost in one, the aspiration of the soul to the personal God, and the imperative of the conscience impelling to the right. It was to express this organic union, this vital integration of faith with good works, that this article was shaped.

I have said, that this doctrine of the necessary union of holiness in practice with faith, lies at the very foundation of Christianity, and intimated that all false religions have failed in securing the connection. They have so failed practically, and, for the most part, even in idea. But yet this necessity of right living, as one of the vital organs of true religion, was not wholly unperceived even by the pagan world. The best minds of Greece and Rome felt, and more or less clearly taught, that there could be no true worship of God, without the practice of goodness in the life. The whole scope of that most wonderful passage in all heathen literature, the Apology of Socrates, is to this effect: "If you release me, O Athenians," says Socrates, in substance, "I shall only go back to tell the young men that there is nothing better than to cultvate justice and temperance and knowledge in the soul." It is the final protest of the martyr-spirit against the divorce between religion and right-living, that was attempted to be made by the Sophists in Athens; an attempt that was only too effectually realized, in later times, by the Romish Church.

†In the Second Alcibiades, there is a discussion between Alcibiades and Socrates concerning the efficacy of prayer; and the conclusion is reached that no religious service, whether of prayer or sacrifice, is acceptable to God that is

---

*See De Quincey in frequent allusions to the poverty of the Greek language, though so rich in all other vocabularies, in terms expressive of the spiritual ideas of the Hebrew and Christian faith.

†2d Alcib., 149, E. 150.

offered by a corrupt man. "It would be a dreadful thing," says Socrates, "if the Gods looked to gifts and sacrifices, and not to the soul, if a person be holy and just. Justice and self-control, it seems then, are honored above all things by the Gods:" which sounds very much like the answer made by Samuel to Saul when he rebuked his sin of disobedience, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

Indeed, as soon as the mind of man begins to right itself, after the perturbations of the great storm of sin in the heart, and to take its bearings, it settles inevitably to the conviction that any true service or worship must go forth into obedience. Epictetus and Socrates, in their stammering and incoherent way, join their voices with that of the apostle James, saying, "Faith without works is dead." "Be assured," says Epictetus, "that the essence of piety towards God lies in this, to form right opinions concerning him, as existing, and as governing the universe justly and well. Fix yourself in this resolution to obey him, and yield to him, and willingly follow him amidst all events. When you have recourse to divination * * attend to the great diviner, the Pythian God, who once cast out of the temple him who neglected to save his friend."* So, according to the great stoic moralist, to pray in the temple is of no avail if one neglect to do his duty out of doors. This is only the concrete form of the abstract statement of our article: "this faith must bring forth good fruits * * it is our duty to perform those good work which God has commanded."

With this writing of God in the natural conscience and heart; the revelation of God in his word is in full accord. If any one aim is clear in all God's revealed plan, as the final end to be secured by the work of redemption, it is that men may be brought to the practice and enjoyment of holiness. If faith is a pre-eminent grace, it is so because it alone can open the way through Christ into the actual possession of this

---

*The Works of Epictetus translated by T. W. Higginson, pp. 387, 388, 389.

holiness. It is blessed mainly, because it leads to that which is still more blessed. "Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." Solomon was as near to a speculative philosopher as the Hebrew mind, with its intensely practical and spiritual bent, apparently could come; and he joins in the solemn verdict of the reason of the heathen world, "naturally Christian," to the clear revelation of the Holy Ghost, when he sums up his speculations on life and religion in the close of Ecclesiastes: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man."

This is the end of ends. This is the ultimate goal of that whole vast sweep of catastrophe, development and deliverance wrought out in the history of redemption. As Paul expresses it, "our Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

The Reformers felt this truth deeply. It is true, their controversy with Rome hinged on the doctrine of Justification by faith. But that which drove them to assert a free justification, without regard to works, was their recognition, that the righteosness demanded by God was too high for them, and yet only their just debt. Man must be justified gratuitously through faith, because he could never fulfil the requirements of a law that was holy and just and good. But, being justified, disencumbered of his load of past guilt, no pretence to religion could be allowed for a moment that did not acknowledge the claim of the law to a full obedience. No faith could be thought worthy the name that did not spontaneously work the works of holiness. The cry of the justified man is, "Oh, how love I thy law." Luther says, "it is necessary that pious teachers should as diligently press the doctrine concerning good works as the doctrine concerning faith. For Satan bitterly hates and resists both. Apart from the matter of justification, no one is able to commend the good works that are commanded by God highly enough."*

---

*See Gerhard. Loci Theolog. Vol. 8, p. 22.

Through the twilight of moral consciousness in the Church, the Reformers groped their way to the fundamental truth of this Article. It was not seen so clearly then, as the Church is coming to see now, that the one final necessity in God's government is habitual and actual goodness. But the Confession gives no uncertain sound on this vital point. It declares, with a sufficiency needing no fortification in these days of light and strength, "that this faith must bring forth good fruits; and that it is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded."

A truth so cardinal to Christianity, so imbedded in the whole texture of Scripture, so naturally apprehended by man's innate sense of religion, could not have been wholly lost, even in the corruption of the Romish Church. In its formal affirmation, it never had been lost. The phrase "good works" had been blazoned on her banners, and sounded from her pulpits, until it had become nauseous to men. But, as disease changes the healthy functions of the body into sources of evil, so the pervading plague, in the life of that Church, had turned the truth, that holiness is necessary, into a moral poison. When the Reformers declared that "faith must bring forth good fruits, and that it is our duty to perform good works," the whole Romish faculty could say, Amen. But the next step taken in this article showed the gangrene which, under the name of "good works," had eaten nearly all true holiness out of the heart of the Church. The first step, in the definition of the doctrine, was to determine what are the "good fruits," "good works" that constitute holiness.

II. THE NATURE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE NEW OBEDIENCE.

On this point the Confession is very explicit. It determines both, by *exclusion* and *inclusion*, the scriptural character of that holiness which is required in believers. By declaring the rule of holiness, and its origin, it defined what was not, and what was, essential to the New Obedience.

a. By exclusion: "it is our duty to perform those good works *which God has commanded.*" The rule of "good works"

is the express command of God. We are to do those things which God bids us, and no more. This one phrase, "which God has commanded," struck a fatal blow. It was a two-edged argument. It not only sheared away the cunning web of works of supererogation, which Rome had used to catch souls in, as silly flies; but it also demolished the whole fabric of multiplied devotions, penances, ecclesiastical duties, fasts, pilgrimages, mortifications, which had grown to a yoke, like that complained of by Peter, "which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear."

It had been taught that there were services of religion, and good works, not demanded by the law of God, and yet in themselves good, and therefore worthy of reward. By the performance of what were called "*consilia evangelica*," fastings, pilgrimages, vows of monasticism, poverty, obedience, continence, and the like, it was held to be possible to lay up a treasure of merit above and beyond all that the strict law of God required.* The logical outgrowth from this was the doctrine of the transfer of merit, the procuring of pardon and eternal life through the merits of the saints.† Then followed, in train, the intercession of saints, the mechanical theory of holiness, by which righteousness was made something that could be put on and taken off, without any change in the inner man, until at last, the monstrous shock of the doctrine of Papal indulgence, according to which a man living in sin could, for money, purchase pardon and salvation of the Holy Father who kept the treasury of the saints' merits, roused the besotted nations to the protest of the Reformation.

---

*Bellarmin, in defending this doctrine, goes so far as to collect a number of passages from the early Church Fathers, Origen, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, to show that they held the doctrine of works which more than satisfy the requirement of the law.—*Müller's Christian Doctrine of Sin,* Vol. I., p. 51.

†"Thomas Aquinas places the evangelical counsels, and the more than sufficient works, entirely in the sphere of asceticism;" *i. e.*, they belong to a sphere of holiness beyond what the strict law requires, and above the capacity of ordinary men.—*Müller's Christian Doctrine of Sin,* Vol. I., p. 52.

This simple phrase of the Confession, "which God has commanded," like the smiting of the sun on the rack of the morning mist,dissolved the whole cunning fabric of works of supererogation. That only is true obedience which can show for its sanction a "Thus saith the Lord."

Luther says, in his Sermon concerning good works, "it is required of any work that professes to be a service of God, not only that it aim at the glory of God, but also that it be commanded by him."

"Those good works are not truly good, which each one devises himself with a good intention, or which are performed according to human tradition, but those which God himself has prescribed and commanded in his word."*

Chemnitz in his chapter, "*quae sint opera in quibus Deus vult renatos exercere obedientiam*," details at length the rule of new obedience:

1. Not what seems to us right.
2. Not what has been suggested by our good intent.
3. Not what has been handed down from our fathers.
4. But what God has positively commanded.†

In another place, he condenses the scriptural argument against works of supererogation into a nutshell: "It is most true that the Holy Spirit renews the heart and makes it will and do obedience to God. Does God therefore wish that the renewed should, of their own motion and private counsel, or from traditions of men, choose the works wherein they shall glorify God? By no means: for Paul expressly condemns ἐθελοθρησκείας, (self-imposed services), (Col. 2 : 23). God wishes, therefore, the whole life of the regenerate to be ruled by his word, not only in faith, but also in good works. Charity, which is the root and sum of all good works, is said to be no more than the fulfilling of the law."‡

The horns of the dilemma, on which the whole theory of "works" was impaled, were inevitable. If a work is com-

---

*Formula of Concord—Good Works.

†Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars tertia, p. 14.

‡Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars tertia, p. 37.

manded by God, then it is our duty to do it, and when it is done most perfectly, we have only performed our whole duty; if not commanded, it is no "good work." "Who hath required this at your hand," is the stern query with which all "*evangelica consilia*" and works of supererogation are met.

This was returning to the old land-marks. It was a reinstatement of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only infallible rule of practice. It was not only a declaration of the necessity of holiness, but it was also a determination of the standard by which all goodness was to be measured and directed. It was not only pointing out the direction in which we must steer, but it was furnishing also the chart and compass by which to steer. The Reformers aimed primarily to correct the errors of the Roman apostasy. But their correction, like all true reform, reached farther than they could see:

———"they builded better than they knew."

They have furnished a permanent rule of true righteousness. What is the boundary of right? Where does the domain of absolute duty end, and the field of expedience, the weighing of means and ends, begin? How clear is the definition of the Confessiou: "those good works which God has commanded."

We may test the universal application of this rule on some of the latest born errors of our own times. Mr. J. S. Mill represents a movement in our day, to put aside the express command of God as a standard of right, on the ground that Christian morality is deficient in scope. "Many essential elements of the highest morality," says this author in his work "On Liberty," "are among the things which are not provided for in the recorded deliverances of the Founder of Christianity. * * I believe that other ethics than any which can be evolved from exclusively Christian sources must exist side by side with Christian ethics, to produce the moral regeneration of mankind." This has a very grand sound: the revelation that is heralded with such solemn trumpetings must be splendid, indeed. But when Mr. Mill descends from the

sublimities of vague generalities, to specify the corrections he would graft on the moral code propounded in God's word, we find that it is with his scheme, as with a great deal of modern philosophy, "*ignotum pro magnifico est.*" Christian ethics are too narrow for modern expansion. Why? "Its ideal," Mr. Mill answers, "is negative rather than positive; passive rather than active; innocence rather than nobleness; abstinence from evil rather than energetic pursuit of good. In its precepts (as has been well said), 'Thou shalt not' predominates unduly over 'Thou shalt.'" We have only to confront this (calling it by the mildest name) misrepresentation with the simple utterance of Christ to see its falsity: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Add to this the elaborations of Christ's command to be found in the twelfth chapter of Romans, the third and fourth of Philippians, and in the close of Paul's epistles generally,—and it must be a strange conscience that complains of this rule of the Confession as too circumscribed. "The good works, which God has commanded" in the Old and New Testaments, open a field for the "energetic pursuit of good," which the noblest men, the world has ever held, have confessed themselves unable to fill up, or even to fully compass in their thoughts.

It is not strange that men, disallowing the validity of the Scriptures as the revealed will of God, should disparage the ethics of the Bible. But something of this supercilious feeling of superiority to the plain rule of God's word, reveals itself in the new commandments promulgated touching good morals in many quarters professedly Christian. The so-called liberal and radical churches of our day, are full of these maggots of a new and advanced morality, which are to hatch out into something that shall soar beyond the narrow pales of the written word. New virtues are invented, and new sins discovered every day. Yesterday, a new commandment was proclaimed: "Thou shalt not drink wine." To-day another precept is added: "Thou shalt give the ballot to woman." All questions of expedience and means are attempted to

be brought within the scope of a positive moral precept. And he, who holds only by the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount, is in danger of being thought no better than a publican and sinner. To all such inventors of new virtues, it may be commended, as a wholesome exercise, to ponder the simple rule of the Confession, "it is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded." "Those," says Prof. Alexander, "who undertake to be more righteous than God's law, in any respect, will be sure to compensate their work of supererogation by greater license in some other form of sin. I once knew a candidate for the ministry, who denounced as a sin, eating meat, and drinking tea and coffee, and, if I remember right, any violation of Prof. Hitchcock's prescription for avoiding dyspepsia. He ended with becoming the hierophant of a conventicle of free-love Perfectionists, and doing what he might to turn temples into brothels."

b. By inclusion. The Confession not only excluded, from the definition of "good works," the notions of men and the traditions of the Church. It included, also, within its scope that which practically Rome had cast out. The phrase "good works" had, under the manipulation of the ecclesiastical system, been emptied of nearly all spiritual meaning. To the Romish layman the term meant, not love to God, love to men, purity of heart, "the fruits of the Spirit," but the performance of innumerable external acts of devotion, penance, ritual correctness and the like. Hence the tremendous recoil of Protestantism against these so-called "good works;" a rebound so violent as to occasion the reproach of the Romish writers, that the Reformers despised good works, and taught that there was no need of them. But, the Confession is equally careful to assert the absolute necessity of the new obedience, and to point out its origin and scope- They, and they only, are truly good works, which flow from a living faith in God. "*This faith,*" (that described in Article IV.) "*must bring forth good fruits.*" The new obedience is to come forth, not on the mechanical compulsion of an ecclesiastical command, nor at the sheer impulse of hope and fear in an unrenewed heart, but from a faith that works by love.

"The first and chief work," says Melanchthon, "is faith itself: God especially requires in his worshipers this faith, and this confidence produces the love of God."* This gives us the source and extent of the New Obedience. It begins in faith. It is fed at that deepest of all fountains in human nature, opened only by the divine hand, the trust of the soul in an invisible, but real and ever present, God. The world, in its best moods, has conceived of high ideals of virtue and rectitude, but it could never command the energy to make them actual. Men have dreamed beautifully of goodness, but none have ever been able to put it into fact, nor even long to keep their dream before them clear in outline and fresh in color.† There is no future for any rectitude that is not rooted in God. There is no summer flow for the streams that head short of the heart of the mountains. This unfailing spring the Confession finds in the faith that unites to God.

"With the reconciliation to God, that is effected by faith, comes also the gift of the Holy Spirit, which renews the heart and causes it to begin to love God, and delight in his law after

---

*Corpus Reformat., Vol. XXI., pp. 311, 312.

†Lecky notices the immeasurable superiority of Christianity over Paganism in this respect, in a very brilliant passage: "The ethics of Paganism were part of a philosophy. The ethics of Christianity were part of a religion. The first were the speculations of a few highly cultivated individuals, and neither had, nor could have, any direct influence upon the masses of mankind. The second were indissolubly connected with the worship, hopes and fears of a vast religious system, that acts at least as powerfully on the most ignorant as on the most educated. The objects of the Pagan systems were to foretell the future, to explain the universe, to avert calamity, to obtain the assistance of the gods. They contained no instruments of moral teaching analogous to our institution of preaching, or to the moral preparation for the reception of the sacrament, or to confession, or to the reading of the Bible, or to united prayer for spiritual benefits. To make men virtuous was no more the function of the priest than of the physician. On the other hand, the philosophic expositions of duty were wholly unconnected with the religious ceremonies of the temple. To amalgamate these two spheres, to incorporate moral culture with religion, and thus to enlist in its behalf that desire to enter, by means of ceremonial observances, into direct communication with Heaven, which experience has shown to be one of the most universal and powerful pas-

the inner man: in this way come good works, and they are truly such which proceed from such a root."*

Thus the Confession supplies, in the strong throbbing heart of faith, an engine that can propel the whole machinery of right living. "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." It is faith that unites to Christ, and so to God. It is faith that enables man to bring forth good fruits. Justification and sanctification, are thus seen to be twin branches, shooting, with their broad latitude of gratelful shade and fruitage, from the one trunk of a living faith. We are saved by faith, and we are made clean and able to good works, holy living, by the same faith in God.

One point more, and we have done with this side of our subjeet. What is the scope of this term, "good works?" What are the "good fruits" that "faith must bring forth," the "good works" which "it is our duty to perform?" The nature of the truth declared, is disguised somewhat by the narrow and technical character of the terms used. The phrases "good fruits," "good works," meant to the ear of the world, that had been so long filled with the teaching of Rome, only outward acts of morality, or even less than this, mere ritualistic observances and ecclesiastical duties. They were almost hopelessly infected with the plague of formalism and a technical holiness. They were but poorly fitted to carry the large meaning of the Reformers.

It is almost sad to see how the men, who built the superstructure of the New Theology, labor to disentangle their

---

sions of mankind, was among the most important achievements of Christianity. It was the distinguishing characteristic of Christianity, that its moral influence was not indirect, casual, remote, or spasmodic." (History of European Morals, Vol. II, p. 2). Mr. Lecky dwells mainly on the instruments of this moral culture, preaching, sacraments, reading the Bible, united worship; but all these only lead our thoughts along to the source, whence flowed the life that used these, to that "faith," which "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." It was this divine origin of the New Obedience that the Confessors had in mind, when they declared "that this faith must bring forth good fruits."

*Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars Tertia, pp. 29, 30.

deep scriptural views, concerning holiness, from the trammels of words which they felt, in a manner, compelled to use. They were not the first, nor the last, who gave birth to thoughts too great to be cradled in the language of their schools and times. They meant, in their struggling way, to declare that true religion must include right living, that holiness of life is eternally wedded to faith in God. But the words by which they affirm this, are like the shield in the old story, that showed red or white as it was seen from opposite sides: to their Roman antagonists, they meant one thing, to us, who read them in the light of their whole theology, altogether another. Expand these words, "good fruits," "good works," to mean holiness of heart and life, and we have the doctrine the authors of the Confession intended to teach.

Chemnitz, in his chapter, "*Quae opera facienda*," says: "Not only is it our duty to perform the external works of the Decalogue, which even impious men can counterfeit, but also to originate an inward obedience. But these inner works are belief in God's word, the fear of God, trust in God."*

"The first and chief grade of good works," says Gerhard, "is inward obedience of the heart to God, of which the principal parts are the fear and love of God." He then proceeds, in the order of their dignity, to specify five classes of good works, in the last of which he puts "the ceremonial duties of the first table;" meaning by these what may be called ritualistic or ecclesiastical observances.† This was just reversing the old order. Rome had so long accustomed men to a mere mechanical performance of routine duties, that it was almost forgotten what holiness was. Her highest virtue was obedience to the Church. A spiritual, inward obedience, seemed something very petty. Her order of obligation was, first the Church, then man, then God. Baxter declares, in one of his characteristic passages, that after much horror of Rome, as corrupt in doctrine, he had, in his riper wisdom,

*Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars Tertia, p. 1.

†Loci Theolog. J. Gerhard, Vol. VIII., p. 2.

come to see that her worst heresy was that of practice. "Ignorance and immorality in the people," was her high crime. The substitution of artificial duties, pertaining to the outward life, for, what the old writers love to call, works of inward obedience, the inward motions of the Spirit, was a worse error, in reality, than Mariolatry, Purgatory, Intercession of Saints, or even Justification by Works. This error the authors of the Confession corrected, by restoring to their large, scriptural and spiritual sense, the terms, "good fruits," "good works." Good works were—Love to God, Trust in God, Love to men, Purity of heart and life—in fine, the "fruits of the Spirit," described by the apostle. Thus the stream of a living faith was turned at last into that Augean stable, the Romish doctrine of "works."

We come, in the course of our inquiry, to consider,

III. THE GROUNDS OF OBLIGATION TO THE NEW OBEDIENCE.

To the mind of the Reformers, this was the most important side of the whole doctrine. This is evident from the very structure of the Article. It has on it the smell of battle. It is framed, in this part of it, with a view to defence against the errors of Rome, rather than to a positive and purely dogmatic statement of the truth. Negatively, therefore, the ground of obligation is stated, and defended, quite at length: "they teach that this faith must bring forth good fruits, etc., * * *not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before God. For, remission of sins, and justification, are secured by faith; as the declaration of Christ testifies: 'When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants.' The same thing is taught by the ancient ecclesiastical writers: for Ambrose says: 'This has been ordained of God, that he who believes in Christ shall be saved without works, receiving remission of sins through faith alone.*" This was to meet the ground of obligation that logically correlated itself to the Romish theory of salvation. At Rome salvation had a definite price. Man, it was taught, could, and must, merit pardon and obtain eternal life, on the ground of just desert, in return for his righteous obedience. He was to enter heaven because, in virtue of his

good works, he had a claim to eternal life. Hence the necessity of good works. They were the price paid for salvation. I must do them because they are the only coin current on the exchange of heaven.

Such a view of the necessity of good works, was destructive of the very life of Christianity; and that in a two-fold way. It destroyed the character of grace, and changed God from a Father, freely pardoning his children, and preparing for them, out of his own resources, a way of redemption, to a spiritual merchant, selling pardon and heaven for a sufficient quantity of righteousness. As Paul has put it: "If by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace."

As a second, and equally disastrous consequence, this view robbed the practice of goodness of its highest value. It degraded holy living from its high rank, as the outflow of a spiritual faith in God, the outleap of the heart to the Father of grace and goodness, to be only the stipulated price of a bargained salvation. It has been charged on Christianity, as a grave defect, that it "holds out the hope of heaven and the threat of hell, as the appointed and appropriate motives to a virtuous life; in this, falling far beyond the best of the ancients, and doing what lies in it to give to human morality an essentially selfish character."* The Romish ground of obligation to good works, goes far to justify whatever of truth there is in this charge. "Do good," says the Romish theology, in substance, "that you may be safe." Surely any teaching that makes holiness, in its naked beauty, less beautiful and venerable in the eyes of men, must be contrary to the mind of God.

The guarded statement of Art. IV., "that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works; but that they are justified gratuitously, for Christ's sake, through faith," was sufficient refutation of the corrupt doctrine of Rome. But the Confessors, like men who having in

---

*J. Stuart Mill, on Liberty.

trust a priceless treasure, make assurance doubly sure, and post triple lines of sentinels about the key of their position, guard against this error, by the negative declaration of the doctrine of "good works." Not content with their own decided declaration, they fortify their position with the testimony of Christ, and the authority of the Fathers. They felt themselves called to this apparently redundant defence, the more especially, because it had been maintained that, however good works might be excluded from any share in meriting or procuring justification, they were yet necessary to obtaining the rewards of salvation, and for retaining salvation after it had been freely given. The controversies, that fought themselves out, died, and were renewed, about these fine distinctions, were interminable. We may sum up, in the blunt words of Chemnitz, the gist of the whole matter, and remark how the theologians, of that period, construed and defended the negative side of this Article.

"It is not true, as some pretend, that good works, although unnecessary to merit or obtain salvation, are necessary to retain, preserve and complete our final safety. For the form of apostolic doctrine attributes the preservation and completion of salvation, its middle and end, as well as its beginning, to the grace of God alone, for Christ's sake, without works; which grace is received, retained, and preserved through faith alone. 'By faith we,' not only 'have access into this grace;' but also by faith 'we stand in this grace,' and, by faith, 'rejoice in hope of the glory of God.' (Rom. 5 : 2)."* This, with Quenstedt's felicitous epigram, may suffice for the negative side of this part of our subject: "Good works are not the way *to*, but only ways *in* the kingdom."† To this add one, from Gerhard, even happier: "Good works do not make one good, they only show him to be so."‡

We turn now to the positive side of the ground of obligation. If good works are not necessary to obtain pardon and

---

*Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars III., p. 53.

†Quenstedii Theolog. Didactico-Polemica, Pars IV., p, 331.

‡Loci Theolog. J. Gerhard, Vol VIII., p. 25.

salvation, on what ground are they necessary? The answer of the Confession to this, is clear and final. Its authors do not, after the fashion of much modern reform in theology, demolish the ancient bulwarks of religion, to leave those who, had trusted in them, naked and defenceless. The Romish ground of obligation to good works, viz: that of their essential merit in the purchase of salvation, though utterly untenable and bad enough in its practical results, was yet better than no ground of obligation at all. It was better to be impelled to right living, with the hope of securing heaven thereby, than to have no impulse at all. It is better now, for the millions of the Romish communion, to believe that good works must be done to secure salvation, than to believe right living has no real ground of obligation, outside of the fantasy and self-imposed yoke of one's own sense of moral fitness. It is better to be an Austria, besotted, yet having some ground of obligation felt by its subjects, than a France, with the false ground removed, but none put in its place.

The Confessors were ready to replace the crazy bulwark which Rome had furnished. "This faith must bring forth good fruits * * it is our duty to do those good works which God has commanded, because it is his will." The more we study this simple declaration, the more impregnable will appear their position, the more pregnant the words they use. Why must we do these good works? Because "it is our duty." What obligation to the practice of a holy life? Because "it is the will of God." It will be observed that there are two steps taken in the statement and unfolding of this ground of obligation.

a. "*It is our duty.*" The ground is that of moral right. The force of the original is, if anything, stronger: "*debeat,*" "*oporteat.*" The appeal here is to the ultimate imperative of conscience. We must, because we ought. No idea in human consciousness is more unique than that expressed by the word "ought." It carries us into a realm as new as that into which sight introduces us. Its deliverances are wholly untranslateable into other forms. It emerges into consciousness with a distinction, like that of another sense. It makes its deliver-

ances with an authority that, though often opposed, hated, derided, though often traversing the dearest schemes of man's ambition and pleasure, yet has been felt by all men, in their highest moments, to be irresistible and full of the highest inspiration. It has been recognized, to use Lecky's eloquent words, as "constituting at once the evidence of a Divine element within us, and the augury of the future that is before us." But modern speculation has undertaken to resolve this idea into simpler elements. Under the analysis of the subtlest psychology the world has ever seen, the associational philosophy of Bain and Mill, this imperative of conscience resolves itself back into certain natural effects of association. Certain impulses of hope and fear, say these writers, become connected by association with certain prescribed courses of conduct. These associations are transmitted, in continually increasing strength, from generation to generation, till all traces of the connection by which they were formed, are lost, and only the residuum of actual tendency is left. This tendency is what we call conscience. What we took for the voice of God, is only the vibration of a nerve, that goes on recording itself long after the blow that caused it is forgotten. What we respected as the imperative of a moral sense, final and authoritative, is only the recurrence of certain impulses, set in motion in our ancestors, far beyond our knowledge.

This is very simple. But is it true? The philosophers seem to have analyzed all the authority of conscience away. But their analysis steers its airy way through the empty heaven of hypothesis. Their train of argument, like the gossamer thread of the spider that lets itself down out of the clear sky, has no perceptible holding-place. There is not, in all their fine fabric, so solid a fact as the simple testimony of conscience.

Two voices sound from the soul, which no philosophy has ever been able authoratively to silence or to contradict: "I am," and "I ought." Huxley himself, fiercest and ablest, though frankest, of the materialist school, confesses reluctantly, that, for the first of these declarations, philosophy has

no sufficient answer. The testimony of consciousness to its own free, self-determining nature is final.* So, too, the testimony of conscience, that we are under a solemn law of obligation to right, that consciousness expressed most tersely and vividly by "I ought," is, at least tacitly, admitted to be irrefutable. In that famous definition, by this same author, of the "liberally educated man," the last crowning touch of completeness is, that his "passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, *the servant of a tender conscience.*" What is this but an unconscious testimony to the authority of the moral sense? Mr. Lecky, who seems, in his "History of European Morals," to make the laws of right as flexible and shifting as the currents of the summer wind, yet testifies, at last, that the "instinctive, or moral nature, is as truly a part of our being, as is our reason," and "teaches us what reason could never teach, the supreme and transcendent excellence of moral good." "In it," (our moral nature), "we have the common root of religion and of ethics, for the same consciousness that tells us that, even when it is in fact the weakest element of our constitution, it is, by right, supreme, commanding, and authoritative, teaches us also that it is Divine."†

The very men who anatomize conscience, till there is no soul of force or right left in it, yet finally confess, by the very necessity of their nature, by their avowed indignations and enthusiasms, that the dethroned power, though they have proved it to be no rightful power, still holds a resistless sceptre.

The Confession thus bases the obligation to right living on a ground of sanction that is, our enemies themselves being

---

*"Does human nature possess any free, volitional, or truly anthropomorphic element, or is it only the cunningest of all Nature's clocks? Some, among whom I count myself, think the the battle will forever remain a drawn one, and that, for all practical purposes, this result is as good as anthropomorphism winning the day."—*Lay Sermons, Addresses, etc.*, p. 164.

†Lecky's "History of European Morals," Vol. I., pp. 57, 58.

judges, ultimate and immoveable, as constituting a part of the fundamental law of our nature. "It is our *duty* to do those good works which God has commanded." Of course where the appeal is to a tribunal whose judgment cannot be re-argued, but is final, there needs no links of reasoning to be forged and welded to enforce the authority of the judgment. When conscience speaks finally and decisively, the mind ceases from its quest after a ground of authority. As a matter of fact, the confessors and the theologians of the formative period of our confessional theology, have practically left their case, so far as this ground of obligation is concerned, to rest here. After affirming that it is our duty to do "good works," they cease from the attempt to show why duty is a sufficient ground of obligation, or to prove, with some modern moral philosophers, that it is necessary to do what we ought to do.

b. But there is yet another step in the process by which the Reformers established the ground of obligation to good works: "it is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded, *because it is his will.*" They design by this sanction, to point out the source of that moral imperative, which emerges into actual force in the voice of conscience. We are to do good works because it is our duty: "ought," says the moral sense, and that is final. And that moral sense stands over the will and life, as their rightful ruler, whose command may be disobeyed, but never annulled, because it is so constituted by the will of God. The final reason of all right living is, "it is the will of God."

The Reformers were not inclined to make the Confession a place for fine metaphysical disquisition. They had no mind to decide by the use of the term, "will of God," what is the metaphysical ground of right. It is true, we may press their words to their strict logical import, and argue, with at least a verbal show of justice, that they expressed in this term, "because it is the will of God," their settled belief that the ground of right is the ultimate, arbitrary determination of God. But, in all fairness, that construction cannot be pressed. They meant, as it appears to me, to affirm only that, *for us,*

the final ground and sanction of right is to be found in the discovered will of God. They leave undetermined the query, whether God wills the constitution and nature of right, by a sheer exercise of his almighty and original fiat, or only declares a law already existent in the very nature of things. We come here to that threshing-floor of metaphysical subtleties, where Lowell satirically affirms "theologians thresh their wheatless straw."

The native moral sense does not delay its obedience for an answer to the question, Does God will right living because it is right, or is it right because God wills it. In every age of the world, a "Thus saith the Lord" has proved final, so far as the demands of the moral sense are concerned, and an end of all controversy. If there be any reason of right, back of God's will and pleasure, it is a reason that the conscience and heart of man, whatever the restless intellect, with its endless inquisition, may demand, never feel the need of.

"The voice of duty is the voice of God."

The elaboration of this simple and final ground of obligation, in the after controversies and dogmatic theologies of the Lutheran Church, add nothing to its force. They rather weaken it, on the principle that one strong argument, and half a dozen weak ones, make a feebler impression than the single strong point left to stand alone. Or, rather, on the principle that all attempted proof of a self-evident truth, obscures it. The gronnd of obligation defined in the article, is self-evident. It commends itself, at once, to what is deepest and purest in man. "It is our duty:" Every conscience throbs to the call. "Because it is God's will:" That sounds like a finality. It brings us before the high throne, where angels adore and receive the word of command. It fills and satisfies the highest spiritual sense as perfectly as the lowest. To base morality there, is to give it the solidest footing. To found holiness simply on that, is to make its foundation broad and deep as religion itself. No sanction can be more awful than the shadowy and supernatural influences, which

this reference to the unseen Lawgiver and Judge of all the earth, gather over the soul. No wooing to goodness can be sweeter than that couched in this simple declaration, "it is the will of God."

We give a few of the ramifications into which the theologians, of the development period, push out the simple ground of obligation to good works laid down in this Article.

Chemnitz, in answer to the question, "*Propter quas causas facienda sint bona opera!*" tabulates his elaborations as follows:

"*I. With respect to God.*

1. It is his command.
2. It is his wish.
3. That we may be obedient sons of our Father.
4. The Son of God redeemed us to be pure.
5. Good works are the fruits of the Spirit.
6. That God may be glorified through our good works.
7. That we may be imitators of God.
8. That we may walk worthy of God.

II. With respect to ourselves.

1. Because the renewed should be new creatures.
2. Because sons of light should not walk in darkness.
3. For a testimony of true faith.
4. That the difference between a dead and living faith may be marked.
5. Lest faith and the Spirit be lost.
6. To escape punishment of this life.
7. To obtain the promised reward.

III. With respect to our neighbor.

1. To help him.
2. That we may allure others to piety by our example.
3. That we may give no offence.
4. That by well-doing we may shut the mouths of gainsayers."

These various divisions, which we have given only in brief, and condensed from their original form, are supported by copious proof-texts from the Scriptures.*

---

*Loci Theologici Chemnitii, Pars Tertia, pp. 60, 61.

Gerhard gives an amplification much after the same style, which he sums up after this fashion:

"1. *Necessity of command*, because God in the Decalogue commands a zeal of good works.

2. *Necessity of debt*, arising from the former, because we owe to God, as our Creator, etc., filial obedience, to our neighbor a zeal of kindness and offices of love.

3. *Necessity of order*, because the order of justice remains perpetual, that the rational creature should obey the Creator.

4. *Necessity of consequence*, because good works continually accompany and follow faith.

5. *Necessity of hypothesis*, because, unless we would lose faith, the grace of God, etc., we must devote ourselves to good works.

To this necessity, *Melanchthon* joined the *worthiness* and *utility* of good works, where, by *worthiness*, is not to be understood any merit of divine grace, etc., nor any *perfection* of good works before the judgment of God, nor *causality* in the matter of justification; but a gratuitous acceptance by God, who considers the obedience of the renewed, that proceeds from faith, to be genuine and pleasing, and affixes to the same gratuitous rewards.

Hutter adds two classes, making five:

1. Necessity with respect to God.
2. Necessity with respect to angels.
3. Necessity with respect to our neighbors.
4. Necessity with respect to ourselves.
5. Necessity with respect to devils."

The pious Gerhard remarks näively, that two of these classes are unnecessary. With which sentiments I think we can heartily agree.

All this elaboration is, practically, so much dead lumber, in any attempt to set this great truth on its firmest basis. The less there is of matter, intermediate to the direct impact of the will of God upon the conscience, the quicker and more tender is the moral sense. Thus we find, in seasons of revival, when the preaching is peculiarly theological, (using this term in its technical sense), when less of the motives to duty,

and the reasons for holiness, are professedly set forth, but God is held up, his character and will and positive law, the stronger the influence upon the consciences of men. The idea of God and God's command, laid on the mind, burn their way through to the very quick of conscience, and kindle the most ardent flame of holy practice.

We have to notice the corrective character of this ground of obligation, in relation to errors that rose on this subject in later times. These errors we may trace all to a single root, an undervaluation of holiness, as an end in itself. Whatever leads men, theoretically or practically, to regard goodness as a means to an end, rather than an end sufficient in itself,, is false to Scripture, and false to the necessities of man's own nature. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." (1 Thes. 4 : 3)." "The end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." (1 Tim. 1 : 5. This has been effected in two quite opposite directions: by men very religious, and by men very irreligious.

In the terrible recoil from good works, because of the taint they had got whilst serving in the mill at Rome, the Church was in danger of falling into an error quite as pernicious. When men recoil from a bad thing, they generally go into an opposite extreme very nearly as bad.

Accordingly we find, close on the crash of the Reformation, a heresy springing up in the new Church, out of the ashes of the corrupt doctrine of Justification by Works, as we see new growths of another species put forth from the ashes of a burned forest. John Agricola, an early helper of Luther, seized on some extravagant expressions of the great Reformer, with reference to the worthlessness of good works as of saving efficacy,* and speedily brought forth, as a legitimate consequence of Justification by faith, the doctrine that believers are under no obligation to keep the law or do good works. When, in the "Instruction to the Pastors of

---

*Luther, in his writings against the Zwickau enthusiasts, says, "These teachers of sin annoy us with Moses; we do not wish to see or hear Moses;

the Saxon Electorate" (1527), it was enjoined that "all pastors must teach and enforce diligently the Ten Commandments, and not only the commandments themselves, but also the penalties which God has affixed to the violation of them," Agricola bitterly assailed Luther and Melanchthon, as departing from the true faith of the gospel, and declared that the Decalogue is not binding on Christians.* He was followed, later, by Nicolas Amsdorf, and Otto of Nordhausen. Amsdorf, in opposing the errors of one George Major, Professor at Wittenberg, who taught the necessity of good works to salvation, declared that good works were pernicious to salvation. In a more extravagant form still, the Anabaptists, who plagued Luther more than the Papists, scouted the idea that it was wrong, for those who believed, to indulge their carnal desires, since those who were saved by grace were made free from the law.†

In England, under the Protectorate of Cromwell, Antinomianism took a still more positive form, as a legitimate fruit of extreme Calvinism. It was taught by Saltmarsh, one of Cromwell's chaplains, and by Dr. Crisp, an ultra-Calvinist,

---

for Moses was given to the Jews, not to us Gentiles and Christians; we have our Gospel and New Testament; they wish to make Jews of us through Moses; but they shall not."—(*Werke*, Walch's Ed., XX., 203).

Melanchthon (Loci Communes, 1st Ed., by Augusti, p. 127) declares, that "it must be admitted that the Decalogue is abrogated."

*Among some theses published anonymously at Wittenberg by Agricola, is the following: "Art thou steeped in sin—an adulterer or a thief? If thou believest, thou art in salvation. All who follow Moses must go to the devil; to the gallows with Moses."

†It has been asserted, that in the theological and civil strifes of that stirring time, no discrimination was made between the fanatics of Münster, and the sober Christians, who were to be found among those stigmatized as Anabaptists. Robinson, in his "*History of the Baptists*," as quoted in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia, Vol. I., p. 211, avers that "it has been proved by irrefragable evidence, from state papers, public confessions of faith, and authentic books, that the Spanheims, Heidegger, Hoffman, and others, have given a fabulous account of the German Baptists, and that the younger Spanheim had taxed them with holding thirteen heresies, of which not a single society of them believed a word." See article "Anabaptists," Cyclopædia above mentioned.

that "The law is tyrannical and cruel, requiring what is naturally impossible;" and that "repentance and confession of sin are not necessary to forgiveness." The same errors manifested themselves again in the eighteenth century, about the time of the Wesleyan revival, when, both in the Established Church and in the Dissenting Churches, the doctrine that believers owe no duty of obedience to the law of God, was carried to its highest pitch of folly. Orme, in his "*Life of Baxter*," pithily characterizes and condemns this fatal error: "So far from regarding the moral cure of human nature as the great object and design of the gospel, Antinomianism does not take it in at all, but as it exists in Christ, and becomes ours by a figure of speech. It regards the grace and the pardon, as everything; the spiritual design, or effect, as nothing. Hence its opposition to progressive, and its zeal for imputed, sanctification: the former is intelligible and tangible, but the latter a mere figment of the imagination. * * It boasts in the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, while it believes in no saint but one, that is Jesus, and neglects to persevere."* In short, it is the old folly, come to life again, that James once slew when he said, "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone."

A milder, but equally unscriptural and irrational error was one, that Chalmers felt keenly in his own ministry, viz.: that holiness is to be valued "chiefly as an evidence of justifying faith." He says in a strain, the like of which brought the scourge of Scotch Orthodoxy upon his back with stinging force, "it is, in fact, chiefly valuable on *its own account.* It forms part, and an effective part, of salvation. Christ came to give use a justifying righteousness, and he also came to make us holy—not chiefly for the purpose of evidencing here our possession of a justifying righteousness—but for the purpose of forming and fitting us for a blessed eternity."† On

---

*See, for a fuller account of this subject, the excellent article, "Antinomianism," in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia, from which I have drawn the material above.

†Hanna's Memoir of Chalmers, Vol. II., p. 191.

the publication of his Kilmany Address, in which he exhorted his former parishioners to the practice of goodness, as in itself right and obligatory, because willed by God, he was denounced by the stiff orthodoxy as "a sinner yet to be brought to the knowledge of the truth."* This in 1815. So tenaciously has the horror of good works, that followed on the recoil from the errors of Rome, clung to the Reformed Churches.†

The error of Antinomianism was, at root, the error of that from which it was the extreme recoil, the error of Rome, putting the matter of pardon and safety so much in the foreground, as to fill all the horizon of the gospel. "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," answered Rome, and so degraded holiness to be merchandise, a spiritual *quid pro quo.* "What must I do to be saved?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," for "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," said Antinomianism, and so thrust practical holiness out of doors. But the truth is, good works have nothing to do with salvation, one way or the other. We are saved freely by grace, and the obligation to good works, is not on the ground of price, but the necessity of right; what theologians call *necessitas justitiæ.* And good works are good, not because they save, or evidence faith, or comfort the believer, or any such thing; but simply because they are a part of the moral perfection of the universe, and according to God's will. If the Antinomians had thought more of pleasing God, and less of saving their souls, they would never have fallen into the mire, on the opposite side of the road from the ditch where Rome lay.

The Confession cut the ground from under all this class of

---

*Hanna's Memoir of Chalmers, Vol. II., Appendix A, p. 491.

†For a racy exhibition of the follies with which this suspicion of "good works" has plagued much of Protestant and, more especially, Calvinistic theology, see Henry Ward Beecher's Sermon, "*A Plea for Good Works.*"—Plymouth Pulpit, Vol. V., No. 21.

errorists, by conceding, at once, that those who are saved by grace, are under no legal obligation to do good works, "not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before him," and then setting forth into the light the incontrovertible truth, that we ought to do God's will, whether we be saved or not. The law of right is eternal and immutable, in Heaven and Earth and Hell. "It is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded," whether we be elect or non-elect, saved or lost, simply "because it is his will." This is the duty of angels, fiends, and men alike, and none the less a ground of obligation though we be no more debtors to the law for salvation. The law expressed in "it is God's will," is not statutory, but fundamental, the constitutional law of God's kingdom, and not to be repealed or set aside.

This is set forth in the decisive testimony of this Article: "*it is our duty, etc.*" It is true there was a period, not yet wholly passed away in all parts of the Lutheran Church, in which a dead orthodoxy made null and void this fundamental teaching of the Confession. In the seventeenth century, when the power of the divine life was stifled and overwhelmed by ecclesiasticism, until it made its way to the light again, in the somewhat distorted but living form of Pietism, this Article was thrust into a corner. But it still stood on the record, a part of the common Confession. And it has not been the least of the fruits of the new development of our Church in this country, that the churches of the General Synod have declared, with a fresher and ever deepening emphasis, "*this faith must bring forth good fruits, and that it is our duty to perform those good works which God has commanded, because it is his will.*" The answer to all Antinomianism, theoretical or practical, is found in these strong words of the Confession, "*it is God's will.*"

We turn to notice the perversion of the truth, concerning the obligation to right living, in another direction. A perversion made by men by no means famed for their religion. Mr. Matthew Arnold, a poet and critic of no mean order, has been preaching, for the last few years, a new gospel, the gos-

pel of culture. "The aim of culture," to use another's words, "is the perfection of our human nature on all its sides, in all its capacities."* And not only to secure this for our own individual human nature, but also for the sum-total of humanity with which we stand inseparably connected. In words borrowed from Bishop Wilson, but made, by his felicitous choice and application, Mr. Arnold's own, its purpose is "to make reason and the kingdom of God prevail." This aim seems coincident with that of religion. But Mr. Arnold and his following, teach that religion is only one of many factors to be used in working out the processes of culture. To secure his aim, he would summon to his aid all the help that science, religion, poetry, philosophy and history can afford. Religion, then, is only one of the servants of this new goddess. We are to seek God, not for himself, but for ourselves; a position destructive of the very essence of religion. We are to follow holiness, and practice right living, not as ends of blessedness, and good sufficient in themselves, not "because it is the will of God;" but because we must practice good in order to secure perfection in ourselves. God and goodness are to serve as priests at this new altar of "human perfection." Mr. Arnold, and his school, would land us, practically, not far from the communion of the Comtists, who are engaged, at present, in the "worship of humanity."

Seek and practice the purest goodness, say the advocates of culture, for, in so doing, you will find an instrument for self-culture. Do good works, for so you will best secure the ends of personal elevation. But we are met here by that well-known law in ethics, which, from his happy expression of it, it has been proposed to call after Dr. Newman: "All virtue

*I have used, in this part of my subject, the thoughts, and sometimes the words, of Principal Shairp, of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews, whose little book, "Culture and Religion in Some of their Relations," I could wish that every minister and moral and spiritual teacher, might read and ponder. Nothing sweeter, simpler, or truer has been written on this theme.

and goodness tend to make men powerful in this world; but they who aim at the power have not the virtue. Again: Virtue is its own reward, and brings with it the truest and highest pleasures; but they who cultivate it for the pleasure-sake, are selfish, not religious, and will never gain the pleasure, because they can never have the virtue." Now what more, according to this law, is the ground of obligation to right living, set forth by the culturists, than a refined species of selfishness? If they are selfish, "who cultivate virtue for the pleasure-sake," surely they are no less, who cultivate virtue because virtue brings elevation and breadth of life. If they "who cultivate virtue for the pleasure-sake * * will never gain the pleasure, because they can never have the virtue," then surely they who perform good works for the culture-sake, will never have that fine, essential soul of unquestioning obedience to God, without which good works are not good, but bad.

Above all these subtle delusions and by-ways, through which men propose to allure their unwilling fellows to the practice of goodness, stands the firm unfailing pillar of obligation set up in this Article: "*It is our duty to do those good works which God has commanded, because it is his will.*"

We are to seek God for himself. We are to seek goodness and practice holiness, for his sake, who is goodness itself. This imports into the practice of virtue the one element of life, lacking which, all the noble moralities and aspirations of the pagan world, withered and trailed fruitless in the dust, the sense of personal allegiance and loyalty to a superior. This makes the command of Christ a living word, springing up into unfailing streams of goodness in the life. It is the command of my Lord and Master. This satisfies not only the conscience clamoring for the right, not only the aspirations that look for a better, even a perfect way, but also the hunger of the heart that cries for love, and nourishes itself by the services of love. Nay, it goes deeper still; it fills and completes that spiritual desire after God, the Adorable, the Father of our spirits, which "thirsteth for God," which "cri-

eth out for the living God; * * when shall I come and appear before God."

Thus, at last, doctrine fuses into doctrine, till the circle of the divine life is complete. Faith and works, instead of standing over against each other in irreconcileable contradiction, melt into each other and embrace. "*This faith must bring forth good fruits.*"

We have completed our imperfect survey of this cardinal truth. We have found the necessity of holy living to be a doctrine of natural reason, as well as of revealed truth. We have shown that New Obedience has its source in the spontaneous outflow of a living faith. We have seen that the true ground of obligation to right living, is to be found in the imperative of conscience, not in the meritorious value of good works, and in the will of God, rather than in the excellent results of virtue. Lastly, we have noticed how this ground of obligation corrects the errors of a contemptuous disregard of the works of the law, and of a degradation of holy living to be only the means of self-culture.

The appeal made by this Article, is to the practical life of the believer. It is the article of the market and the shop, the street and the home. It prescribes the dress that religion shall wear when she goes abroad among men. Faith is a sacred and hidden thing, not to be worn like a jewel on one's cap, but treasured in seclusion. But "*this faith must bring forth good fruits*," and so "adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things." It echoes the preaching of John: "Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance." It reiterates the warning of James: "Faith without works is dead."

ARTICLE II.

THE RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH.

By Rev. L. M. Kuhns, Canton, Ohio.

There has been, of late years, an unusual interest awakened, throughout the Church, in the moral training and religious education of the children.

However much diversity of opinion may prevail upon other subjects, all are agreed in this, that more importance should be attached to the religious culture of the young. With this conviction, all the churches are putting forth vigorous efforts in this direction, and striving, in the use of a great variety of means, to meet this solemn responsibility.

Although many of these means are of doubtful propriety, and do not commend themselves to our judgment, as either reasonable or scriptural, yet we must rejoice in the evidences which we have that the Church is waking up to this most important subject; for certainly, in the whole range of religious duties, there is none more important, and none in which our labors are more likely to be crowned with the grandest and most blessed results.

It is with a view to encourage Christian activity in this particular department of church work, and to remove out of the way some of the hindrances to its success, which result from mistaken views, that this article is written.

Without attempting to decide the relation of the children of unbelievers, or to set forth the duties which the Church owes them, the discussion of the subject in this article will be comprehended in this question, and confined to its answer, namely:

What is the relation of the baptized children of believers to the Church, and what is involved in their religious training?

The first thing, then, to be considered, is the relation

which the baptized children of believers sustain to the Church. The views of many Christian people upon this subject, are very vague, unsettled, and unsatisfactory; and, not unfrequently, a fatal error is found here, lying right at the foundation of all our family and church training of children: an error which does more than any other to neutralize and render ineffectual all the efforts which are honestly put forth to bring them up in the nurture of the Lord.

We fail to recognize the baptized children of the Church as Christian children, and to train them up as actual disciples of the Master. In our instruction and intercourse with them, we totally ignore this fact, and give them a kind of prospective training, which contemplates their conversion at some indefinite time in the future. We do not expect to see them grow up and develop as Christians, and we put forth no special efforts to that end, but simply aim at throwing around them such restraints as will keep the "old Adam" in them somewhat curbed, until they are old enough to be converted and transferred from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. And these false ideas, which we entertain ourselves, we impress also upon the minds of our children. We carry them to God's altars, and have the seal of discipleship placed upon them, and then virtually ignore all the benefits involved in this acknowledged relation; and, treating them as little heathen standing outside the covenanted mercies of God, talk to them about becoming Christians, and uniting with the Church, when they arrive at a mature age. We teach them that they are now under the controlling power of sin, but, that after they grow up to the age of fifteen or twenty years, we hope they will be converted and unite with the Church; just as though they were not members of the Church already, and need not make any special efforts now to live a Christian life, for this is not to be expected of them yet. And when, in the simplicity of their hearts, our children inquire of us: "If I am in just the same condition with all other children, and must be brought to God, and into the Church, in precisely the same way, why then was I baptized? What meaning is there in the ordinance as administered to

children?" we find ourselves confounded, and unable to give an answer that will satisfy even the inquiring mind of the little child.

Now, is it at all surprising, that holding such views ourselves, and impressing them upon the minds of our children, many of them should grow up with but little love, or even respect, for the Church? And is it not important that this prevailing evil be corrected, by a return, on the part of the whole Church, to the scriptural idea of the relation of children to the Church. viz., *that the baptized children of believing parents are to be reckoned as members of God's family, and are entitled to a share in the covenanted blessings with their pious parents; and are, consequently, to be trained up as believing children, not outside, but within the Church?*

This is the relation which the word of God most clearly and manifestly recognizes, both in the Old Testament and in the New. The covenant which God made with Abraham, at the time of the organization of the Church, comprehended also his offspring. By virtue of their descent from Abraham, they were all embraced in the covenant, and had an unmistakable title to the blessings guaranteed by that covenant. This was their priceless birthright, the sign and seal of which were found in their circumcision, and it could only be forfeited by their unbelieving disobedience. And when the Church of the old dispensation was merged into that of the new, Peter, on the day of Pentecost, when urging the people to repent and be baptized for the remission of their sins, encouraged them with the assurance, that the ancient promise of God, made to Abraham and his posterity, was still continued to them and their children under the Christian economy, that the introduction of Christianity does not abrogate the old promise, or deprive the children of believers of their birthright, but continues it with the same rich fullness of blessings which it had in the days of Abraham.

If, then, God still continues true to his promise, the relation of the children of believers to the Church remains unchanged. They are still born within the fold, and just as fully entitled to all the blessings of that relation as they ever

were; and because of this birthright which they hold, they are proper subjects of the ordinance of baptism, which is both the sign and the seal of the relation which they sustain to God and his Church, in the economy of grace.

This we conceive to be the correct, the rational and scriptural view, of this subject, and one which invests the baptism of our children with very great significance and importance, and furnishes parents and the Church the strongest possible argument, by which to induce them to live a Christian life and develop a Christian character. That this was substantially the doctrine held by the early Christian Church, is manifest from the following statements made by Neander, in his history of the primitive Church: "The child born in a Christian family, had this advantage over others, that he did not come to Christianity out of heathenism, or the sinful natural life, but, from the first dawning of consciousness, unfolded his powers under the imperceptible, preventing influences of a sanctifying, ennobling religion; that with the earliest germinations of the natural self-conscious life, another divine principle of life, transforming the nature, was brought nigh to him, ere yet the ungodly principle could come into full activity, and that the latter at once found here its powerful counterpoise. In such a life, the new birth was not to constitute a new crisis, beginning at some definable moment, but it was to begin imperceptibly, and so proceed through the whole life. Hence baptism, the visible sign of regeneration, was to be given to the child at the very outset; the child was to be consecrated to the Redeemer from the very beginning of its life."

This view of the relation of children to the Church, does not conflict with the doctrine of native depravity, but maintains, that, while the children of believers, like all others, are born in sin, they do enjoy this advantage, that, by virtue of their descent from Christian parents, they are born within the covenant, and have a place within the Church; and are recognized by God as his children, sinful and depraved though they be by their natural descent, and are placed at once within the conditions of salvation, which may all be fulfilled in the

Spirit's renewing grace, under a proper and faithful Christian culture, so that the child, from its infancy, may grow up in the fear and love of God, and never experience that *marked* change, exhibited in the conversion of adult sinners who are brought to God.

Neither does this view favor the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," and yet it is in entire harmony with Article II. of the Augsburg Confession, which teachers "that since the fall of Adam, all men who are naturally engendered, are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God or confidence toward him, and with sinful propensities: and that this disease, or original sin, is truly sin, and still condemns and causes eternal death to those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit." Here is taught the necessity of the two-fold baptism—the baptism of water, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit; but this does not necessarily imply that the latter is dependent on the former, and can only be received through it; but that in the case of the children of believers, who are born in the Church, they receive the baptism of water as the sign and the seal of the new birth by the Holy Spirit. and of their spiritual relation to God and the Church.

Nor is the position here taken overthrown, or even weakened, by the objection so frequently urged, that many of the baptized children of the Church grow up in sin, and give no evidence of piety, until they have arrived at mature age and are converted. The truth of this statement no one will deny. But it is no matter of surprise when we consider the kind of religious training to which these children have been subjected—a training which has ignored all these relations and benefits, set aside the most solemn obligations of the baptismal covenant, and allowed the children to grow up under the influence of the world and Satan.

Then, too, we sometimes fail to make the distinction between Christian *children* and Christian *adults*, and in forming our judgment, we subject the religion of childhood to much severer tests than we are willing to have applied to our own. We settle down in the conviction that children cannot be

Christians until they have experienced some sudden and marked change, and holding this sentiment, we close our eyes to all the evidences of piety which their lives furnish us. What we would regard as the fruits of an elevated piety in ourselves and other adult believers, we only esteem, in their case, as the fruits of a naturally sweet temper and good disposition; so that it is not true, to the extent which we sometimes suppose, that the children of the Church fail to grow up in the maintenance of their covenant relations with God, and in the development of a Christian character.

If the view here taken, of the relation of children to the Church, be correct, and I think it must commend itself to the judgment of those who give attention to the subject, then the religious training of such children is invested with the highest responsibility; and we should ascertain, if possible, on whom this responsibility rests, and what means can be best employed to meet it.

It is a great mistake for parents to suppose that they can relieve themselves, in this matter, by throwing the whole responsibility on the Sunday School, or the Church. And it is just as great a mistake for the Church to suppose that the parents alone are responsible for the spiritual culture of her baptized children.

The celebrated and somewhat eccentric divine, Cotton Mather, very wisely and truthfully says: "The Lord hath not set up churches that old Christians may keep one another warm while they live, and then carry away the church with then when they die. No! but that they might with all care, nurse still successively another generation of subjects to our Lord, who may stand up in his kingdom when they are gone."

That is the true idea—the Church is to perpetuate herself, by training up her children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," that they may not only be prepared to fill up the places left vacant by those who pass up to their reward, but that, with the addition of those who are brought in as conquests from the world, her numbers may, with every gen-

eration, be greatly multiplied; and that this shall be continued, until the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it.

With this view Christ said to Peter, and through Peter, to the whole Church: "Feed my lambs." And most solemnly did he enjoin it upon his disciples, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Not only suffer them to come, by removing, as far as possible, the hindrances out of their way, but encourage and help them to come. And, in addition to this obligation, laid upon the whole Church, Paul, addressing himself especially to Christian parents, says: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Now, putting this and that together, we get the true idea of the source whence this Christian nurture is to come to our children, and upon whom the responsibility of their training rests. First, upon the Christian parents, who presented them to God in baptism, and thus acknowledged his interest in, and claim upon them; and, secondly, upon the whole Church, as a body, and upon every individual member of the Church, as a part of that body, and particularly upon the Church-Council, as the official representatives of that body.

Every time that one of Christ's little ones is brought into God's sanctuary, and has the seal of discipleship placed upon it, the Master says, not only to the parents, but to the whole Church: "Take this child and nurse it for me, and I will pay thee thy wages." "Bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." "Train it up in the way it should go, and when it is old it will not depart from it."

Now, this is manifestly the true idea of church culture and responsibility, however much it may be practically ignored by those on whom the vows of God are resting. In the very early life of the child, this duty of training it up religiously, rests with the parents, and especially with the mother. God has furnished parents the means of shaping and moulding the character of their child while it is yet almost exclusively under their influence and control. They

give it its first impressions, and these will do much more to give direction to its character, than those which it receives at a later period. And if the parents are impressed, as they should be, with the solemn trust committed to them—the infinite value of the soul of that little one, and the necessity of religion—they will aim at making these very first impressions favorable to piety.

They will not wait to begin this religious culture until the child can talk, and understand religion as taught in precepts, but they will aim at impressing it piously long before that time.

At a very early period of the infant's life, it begins to understand the expressions of the parent's countenance, and to read the mother's thoughts and wishes in her looks and manner. How very soon the little child distinguishes between the mother's frown and the mother's smile—between her impatient scolding and her loving caresses. Thus the mother is impressing herself, her own character and very being, upon the child, during the first months of its existence, and contributing largely to mould it after herself.

If the mother is nervous, fretful, impatient and boisterous in the treatment of her child, the little one will soon catch the same spirit, and become fretful and boisterous also, and give that poor, impatient mother a world of trouble and annoyance. But if, on the other hand, the mother is calm, sympathetic, affectionate, and subdued in her tones and manner, it will be but a little while until these same traits will show themselves also in her child. It is a creature of imitation, and in this way learns it first lessons, and gets its first impressions.

Now, if that mother is truly pious and devotional in her habits, who can tell at just how early a period in her child's life, she may impress it with her own spirit and habits of piety, and thus prepare its young and rapidly developing mind for the oral instruction in religious truth, which is to come afterwards.

It was with this view of the infinite importance of these first impressions, that the reverend and justly celebrated

Rowland Hill, when interrogated by a pious mother, as to the age at which she should commence the religious education of her child, and learning that the child was now a little past three years, replied: "*Madam, you have already lost three of the best years.*"

Another celebrated writer and thinker, who has given this subject the closest attention, says: "Let every Christian father and mother understand, when their child is three years old that they have done more than half of all they will ever do for his character." I have quoted here from Horace Bushnell, who has furnished the reading public a most valuable treatise on "*Christian Nurture,*" from which I quote another passage, bearing directly upon this point: "I think it can be shown by sufficient evidence, that more is done to effect, or fix the moral and religious character of children, before the age of language than afterwards—that the age of impressions, when parents are commonly waiting, in idle security, or trifling away their time in mischievous indiscretions, or giving up their children to the chance of such keeping as nurses and attendants may exercise, is, in fact, their golden opportunity, when more is likely to be done for their advantage or damage, than in all the instruction and discipline of their minority afterwards."

And the same author, speaking of the time when the child, once plastic and passive to the will of the parent, has gotten by the point of absolute disposability, says: "And how much does it signify to the parent, when he feels his power to be thus growing difficult, weak, doubtful, or finally quite ended! What a conception it is, that he once had his child in absolute direction, and the fashioning of his own superior will, to dress, to feed, to handle, to play himself into his sentiments, be the disposition of his dispositions, the temper of his tempers. Was there not something great to be done then, when the advantage was so great—now to be done no more? It will be difficult to shake off that impression; impossible to a really thoughtful Christian soul. And if the will, now matured and gone over into complete self-assertion, rushes into all wildness and profligacy, unrestrained and un-

restrainable, the recollection of a time when it was restrainable, and could have been moulded, even as wax itself, will return with inevitable certainty upon the parents, and taunt, O how bitterly, the neglectfulness and lightness, by which they cast their opportunity away!"

And now, as the child develops, and passes out of this age of impressions, in which it received its first lessons from the manners, the looks and tones of the parents, into the age of language, when it can talk and comprehend the words that may be spoken to it, a new and more extended, if not more important, avenue is opened up, by which the parents may reach the mind and heart of their child, and give it that religious training enjoined by Solomon and Paul, in the passages: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Now the parents can speak to it of God and the Saviour, and begin, in simple language, to explain its relations to the Church and the signification of its baptism. They can begin to teach it scripture truth, as found in the histories and narratives of the Bible. They can tell it the story of Joseph and the pious child Samuel. Of David, the little shepherd boy, who feared and trusted in the Lord, and rose to such an eminence of honor and piety; and especially can they relate to it the touching story of Bethlehem, and the child Jesus, and, by an easy transition, point it also to the cross of Calvary, and this precious Lamb of God, bearing away the sins of the world. And when such instruction is once commenced, even with very young children, it is surprising to see the interest which they manifest in it, and the eagerness with which they receive it; and it is no less surprising to see the amount of religious knowledge, which very young children may thus acquire.

Thus, just as their minds mature, and their capacities develop, they may be taught the precepts of the Bible, and the higher doctrines of religion, a beautiful summary of which is found in the Catechism of the Church.

In the most intimate connection with this home influence

and instruction, stands also the duty of prayer. Children should early be taught that the great God and loving Saviour, with whom we all have to do, demands of us worship—that his daily mercies call loudly upon us for thanksgiving, while our entire dependence upon him demands of us supplication. They should be taught to pray, to come lovingly and reverently, and with the most confident assurance, to God, through Jesus Christ.

The parents should pray for their children, that the divine blessing may continually rest upon them, and accompany all the efforts put forth for their increase in religious knowledge, and the development of their spiritual life. The neglect of this, on the part of parents, will do much to paralyze all their instructions, and furnish evidence of their unfaithfulness to the baptismal covenant, into which they have entered on behalf of their children. But, not satisfied with merely praying for their children, they should also pray with them. There is something terrible in the thought of professedly Christian parents living a prayerless life in the presence of their children; and going up to meet in the judgment, the children whom they had baptized and promised to bring up in the nurture of the Lord, but who never, in all their life, heard them pray.

But now, let it not be inferred from the foregoing views and suggestions on family instruction, that it is the design of this article to teach that parents must tie their children down to this instruction and these religious devotions, to the exclusion of that playful mirth, and romping sport, and exhilarating fun and frolic, all of which are so natural to, and necessary for, the children. There could not be a greater mistake than this, and it is not the intention to set forth any such idea. Such healthy exercises are not inconsistent with the religion of childhood, but, on the other hand, may be made great and important helps to it. The children should not be developed into men and women, in their habits and inclinations, too soon. Let them be children during the period of childhood, and instead of unduly curbing and restraining them in their innocent sports, let

them be encouraged in these things by the parents, and provided with the means and facilities for their enjoyment. Let them enjoy the pleasures of childhood, without having their minds impressed with the idea, that these childish amusements are all foolish, or wrong and inconsistent with the religion which we are teaching them, so that every time they engage in them—and engage in them they will—they do it in violation of their conscience, that is, the false conscience which has been created by their wrong instruction.

But what is designed to be taught is this, that in the interest of parents for the bodily comfort and temporal welfare of their children, they should never lose sight of the fact that they are immortal beings, to be trained up for the skies; and that they endeavor to temper all their pleasures with the grace and beauty and loveliness of religious childhood, so that as they grow up into mature life, they may develop also a Christian manhood and womanhood, which will be their richest crown of glory, both in the present and in the hereafter. They should not be taught that they are Christian men and women, and expected to behave just as men and women do; but that they are *Christian children*, whom Christ, by his love, makes happy, and who must be careful not to do anything that would grieve and offend this loving Saviour.

Such is the home training that the intelligent, prudent Christian parent will aim to give his children. While laboring assiduously for their spiritual improvement, and making a diligent use of all the means which he can command, for the attainment of this end, he will guard carefully against rendering religion repulsive to them, by allowing it to stand all the time right in the way of their pleasures and innocent amusements. He will only put under the ban of prohibition, that which is absolutely wrong, and positively forbidden, or that which is injurious in its tendencies, influences and associations; and, in the enjoyment of innocent pleasures, he will only restrain them when other duties demand their attention, or when it is necessary to teach them lessons of patience and self-government.

Another important duty devolving upon Christian parents,

in training up their children religiously, is to place them, at an early age, under the instruction of the church of which they are properly members. Most of our German churches have connected with them parochial schools, in which Bible instruction forms a part of the daily exercises, and the doctrines and precepts of religion are taught, in connection with the common branches of education. In our English churches but few of these parochial schools are kept up, since the public schools of the country furnish facilities for obtaining a cheaper education, and many of the parents are but little concerned about the moral and religious part of it—some of them even willing that the reading of the Bible and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer should be prohibited.

But we have in nearly all of our English churches the Sunday School, which, measurably, takes the place of the parochial school, and is, perhaps, the next best thing to it that we can have. The special mission of the Sunday School, is the religious instruction and improvement of the children, especially the children of the Church. Here the Church, in recognition of her obligations to feed Christ's lambs, reaches out a helping hand to the parents, and proposes to share this work with them. To this nursery of the Church, this place where she feed and instructs the lambs of the flock, the children should not merely be sent, but taken by their parents. Those parents who send their children to the Sunday School, and then concern themselves no further about it, not even giving it the encouragement of their occasional presence, evince a very imperfect appreciation of parental responsibility, and of the solemnity of baptismal engagements. But, not only should the children be taken to the Sunday School, but also to the Church, and trained up into the habit of church-going, and taught to listen respectfully to the preaching of the gospel. By such a course, the children become accustomed to the services of the Church, and are inspired with reverence for God's holy temple, while truths of the gospel fall, like good seed, into the hearts of many, producing the fruits of piety and holy living. Modern notions and modern practice, I know, are against this sentiment, and

many objections are urged against taking the children to church. It is said, for instance, that it is too wearisome to the children. This objection might, with some propriety, have been urged in a past age, and against a certain class of worshipers, who commenced their regular Sunday services at nine o'clock in the morning, and closed about four or five o'clock in the afternoon, with only a short intermission, for lunch, about the middle of the service; but now, when the whole service does not exceed one hour and a half, the objection has lost all its force. If the children can sit quietly six hours each day in school, they will not be likely to suffer during the hour and a half that they are confined to church on the Lord's day.

It is also urged as an objection, that, by their restlessness, they disturb others. This may sometimes occur, especially with those persons who are easily disturbed in church, but will not likely be a serious hindrance to those who are really interested in the services. Again, the complaint is made in some congregations that they take up too much room, that the church is too small to accommodate the adult members and children too, but in reply to this, it may be urged that it is the business of the church to provide accommodations for all its members, that none may be excluded from the privilege of worshiping God in his holy temple, and that all may regularly hear the gospel preached. But this is not all. In the Lutheran Church catechization is very propely held in high esteem, as one of the most blessed means of imparting religious instruction to the children and youth of the Church. In the catechetical class, the minister is brought into close contact with the lambs of his flock, and has access to their minds and hearts as he can hardly have elsewhere; and, if faithful to his trust, he can scarcely fail to win them to the service of the Master. But if our children are to enjoy the benefits of this instruction and religious intercourse with the pastor, parents must see to it that they attend. This must not be left entirely with the children. Parental influence, and sometimes parental authority, is necessary, and should be ex-

ercised, to secure the attendance of all the children upon these instructions. Compulsory measures should not be employed by parents, to extort religious vows from their children, but the same authority which places them in school, under educational influences, should be used, when necessary, to place them under the instruction and influence of the Church.

Now, such is the religious training of the children of the Church, which, in the judgment of the writer, is contemplated in the divine word, and connected with which is the promise, that when our children grow up, and even become old, they will not depart from it. And it is only asked that the views here set forth receive careful consideration, and if they commend themselves to the reason and judgment of the reader, as I believe they will, let them be adopted practically in all our intercourse with, and instructions of, the children of the Saviour's household, and see if a more healthful state of piety will not be manifested in our families and in our churches. Instead of talking to the baptized children about *joining* the Church, teach them that they are members, that they were born in the Church, and that this relation with its blessings, was signed and sealed to them in their baptism; and that it is expected of them as Christian children, that they will discharge the duties of religion, and grow up into Christ in all things, and at an early age confirm their baptismal covenant, and take their places at the Master's table. Let this be done by parents, by Sunday School teachers, and by the Church, and mark carefully the results, and see if we will not all be agreed in this, that God's old plan of perpetuating and enlarging the Church is much better than any of man's devising.

ARTICLE III.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN.*

Translated from the French by Rev. L. W. Heydenreich, Graduate of the University of France.

The eschatalogical notions, prevalent in the first Churches of Palestine, have been developed separately and systematically in a special book, which is one of the oldest of Christian literature and, at the same time, by its singular fate, one of the most celebrated. Our readers anticipate that we mean the Apocalype. They comprehend that this book deserves a particular study; they expect to find here an explanation of its tendency, aim and contents, and we should hasten to satisfy so legitimate a desire, were it only to render justice to all the extravagant opinions and absurd interpretations which it has experienced. We shall do our best to give the reader correct views on the whole of the book and its form; for, to tell the truth, the exegetists, by endeavoring to find in it their own dreams confirmed, have made people believe that the prophet of Patmos has mocked us by proposing an enigma, the key to which seems to be lost forever. From Origen to Bossuet, from Luther to Bengel, from Newton to our own

---

*The above is a translation of a chapter of "*Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siecle Apostolique, par E. Reuss,* Professor in the Protestant Faculty of the Strasburg University and Seminary. The circumstance that, notwitstanding the very limited number of readers which such a work finds in France, three editions have become necessary, and that, moreover, it has been translated into the Dutch, commends it to every thinking mind and will, if needed, be an excuse for its translation. Although the undersigned knows that the views contained in this chapter are not quite familiar to many a brother, he has thought that, for this reason, its contents might only be the more interesting and induce some readers to devote renewed investigation to a book which for eighteen centuries has been engrossing the attention of Christians. L. W. H.

cotemporaries, divines have vied most unweariedly with each other to unravel the meaning of this book, but without success, their preconceived ideas having rendered it impossible. We boldly and knowingly affirm that the study of this book would hardly lead any one into error, if the prejudices, sometimes incomprehensible, and often ridiculous, of the divines of all centuries, had not surrounded it with difficulties which, up to this time, have frightened and deterred most readers. Without these prejudices, the Apocalypse would be the plainest and clearest book ever written by a prophet.

We do not intend to discuss here the question of its authenticity, any more than we shall do so of any other writing of the New Testament. Our purpose is not to write a history of its literature, but of its dogmas and religious notions. The date of the composition of the Apocalypse being, however, of a certain importance for its understanding and appreciation, we shall, by the way, say a word about it, and, at the same time, point out to the attention of our readers a fact, which, more than any other, proves that the primitive Church considered the Apocalypse not only as a book which to-day we would call canonical, but as the only one of this kind of which she made use. As for the date, there is no apostolical writing in regard to which it can be found with more certainty. The texts in this respect are explicit, as we shall soon see, and nothing has contributed more to mislead exegetical science, than the credit obtained by Irenæus' inadmissible hypothesis, according to which this book was composed at the end of the first century. It was written before the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, during the reign of the Emperor Galba, that is to say, in the last six months of the year 68 of our era. We shall moreover exhibit the irrefutable proofs of our assertion. This high antiquity, in connection with the very nature of the book, which summed up so completely and enthusiastically the ideas and hopes of the first generations of Christians, explains to us, how it came to pass that the Apocalypse was the first book, outside of the Old Testament, the authority and testimony of which ecclesiastical theology invoked, when it kept a deep silence

concerning the other apostles who also had written books and edified the Church.* The antipathy which the Greek Fathers and, since the third century, a few writers of the Latin Church have expressed for the Apocalypse, shows only that the course of ideas had changed, and that the Judæo-Christian eschatology was no longer the basis of the ecclesiastical belief.

The very name of the book, with which we shall occupy ourselves more particularly, places us in the midst of these beliefs. It was the technical term to designate the victorious appearance of the Messiah at the end of time, and, by a very natural metonymy, of which there are other examples in sacred literature,† the word was used, at a later date, to name the books which treated of this appearance. That of John is neither the oldest nor the last.‡ The number of them is, on the contrary, very considerable among both Jews and Christian, but this is the only one which belongs to the so-called apostolic period, and in which the Church took therefore an official interest.

---

*Everybody knows that Justin Martyr does not quote the name of any other apostolical author than that of John, the author of the Apocalypse; before him already Melito of Sardis, whose canon, preserved by Eusebius, contains only the Old Testament, had written a commentary on the Apocalypse.

†The words *Law*, and *Gospel*, first designated either the whole of the legal precepts, or a teaching relating to the coming of the Saviour; these two words finally denoted the books which contained the subjects.

‡When the gift of prophecy had become extinct in Israel, some books, called *Apocalypses*, were written with the purpose to entertain and strengthen among the people the hope of the coming of the Messiah, and bore the names of Adam, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elias, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zephaniah, and others. Later, more Apocalypses, containing pretended prophecies, were composed, both in the Christian Church and by the sects, and their authorship was ascribed either to the apostles or some prominent name of the New Testament. To this class belong the Apocalypses of Zachariah, Stephen, Thomas, Paul, John (different from that contained in the New Testament), etc. We know most of them only by quotations or by fragments. All these writings are apocryphal and are known by the name of Pseudepigraphs, (inscribed with a false name).

L. W. H.

Before analyzing the book itself, let us call to mind the circumstances under which it was written. Psychology and history, especially that of Christianity, explain and establish the fact, that nothing has contributed more to strengthen the energy of religious convictions, and the courage of those who profess them, than oppression and persecution. The effect produced by these means, has always been in inverse ratio to the intended purpose; and undoubtedly nothing has extended so much the influence of the Church as the baptism of blood which was repeatedly thrust upon her by blind and incensed enemies. The history related in the Acts of the Apostles, shows this on a more limited ground, and in a modest proportion; but things soon assumed another aspect, in consequence of the persecution of Nero, which broke out first in the capital, and afterwards raged in the provinces, more as the result of popular fury than of the mandate of superiors. It was especially in Asia Minor, where the pagan superstitions were still more deeply rooted than elsewhere, that the Christians were most violently persecuted. There, and elsewhere, thousands of victims sealed with their blood the faith which they had embraced;* but the perilous state of the infant churches of this province, far from raising doubts in the minds of their members, revived their courage, and filled their leaders with a prophetic enthusiasm, which was almost a guarantee of victory. They did not promise anything new, anything that required a demonstration. It was what had long been foreshadowed, a living and complete picture of the final destiny of mankind. The part assigned to them was not the revelation of abstract subjects, of mysteries unknown till then; what they spoke was in all mouths, in all hearts; it was a treasure handed down by ten generations, and fully warranted by the revelations of the gospel; and the prediction, clear, certain, complete in every respect, presented but one obscure point, namely, the precise time of its actual realization. This time could not be distant; the anguish of the

---

*Apoc. VI., 9 ff.; VII.

world, the crimes of the enemies of God, the desolation of the righteous, all had reached their climax; the Lord could not longer delay coming; all the precursory signs of the great catastrophe had just loomed up; the generation to which Jesus had promised that they would see the kingdom established in its glory, was decreasing day by day. Nay, doubt could no longer exist: the fatal epoch was drawing near;* all that was promised, all that the new revelation of the Lord was to bring, would take place with but little delay.† Many a time this proximity of the coming end is most positively asserted.‡ Prophecy even ventures on determining the duration of the delay, and borrows it from Daniel's Apocalypse, which, it was hoped, would find at last its true solution, and was only to be reproduced and explained. In three years and a half, from the time when the author wrote, all would be consummated. During this period the enemy would yet be master of the ground; during three years and a half the prophets of God would contend against the power of the demon, and finally overcome; in fine, during three years and a half, the Church miraculously protected in the desert, where she has retired, would wait for the defeat of her old adversary; but, after this, the grand scenes of the denouement would follow in rapid succession, astound the world and gladden the hearts of the faithful.§ It is, indeed, only by dwelling on this proximity, in which every Christian believed, that prophecy could reach its aim, comfort the unfortunate, strengthen the wavering, exalt the courage of all and induce them to face death unshrinkingly, and to shed cheerfully their blood for the holy cause in which they fully believed.

The Apocalypse is deprived of all its actuality, of all connection with the circumstances, of all its natural and trans-

---

*Ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς, Apoc. I., 3; XXII., 10.

†Δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, Apoc. I., 1; XXII., 6.

‡Compare Apoc. II., 5, 16; III., 11; XI., 14; XXII., 7, 19, 20.

§Apoc. XI., 2, 3; XII., 14.

parent meaning, by the endeavor to uproot it from the soil on which it was born, and to accommodate it to the whims of a chimerical exegesis of another century. Every expedient of hermeneutical phantasmagoria is employed to find in it the history of our days; in order to make it reveal man's own preconceived ideas, it is distorted so much that it cannot any longer be recognized; it is used and misused by all disordered brains, all delirious imaginations, all bad passions, at the risk of rendering it liable to the suspicion of sensible people, who, by a very natural reaction, have often made it atone for the extravagances of its ill advised interpreters; and by all this it is made only more and more obscure, absurd and dangerous to vertiginous imaginations. In fine, the brilliant colors of its oriental poetry are changed into a vile and heavy coat, under the rude and rough hand of our modern apocalyptics,—as the graceful designs, which adorn the delicate wings of the butterfly, disappear under the eager finger of the child, who admires them by instinct and destroys them by ignorance.

Let us first state the contents of the Apocalypse, and then say a word of its form. As the prologue and epilogue belong to the latter, we shall occupy ourself, for the present only with the body of the book, its prophetical or dogmatical part (chap. iv—xxii, 5).

The series of visions is opened by a description of the throne of divine majesty, a description which is chiefly borrowed and imitated from Ezekiel.* As with this prophet, the most essential attributes of the Godhead, viz., wisdom, power, omniscience and creative activity, are here personified in the four figures of man, lion, eagle and calf, that support the throne. The same want, to render the abstract notion of God accessible to the imagination by means of the hypostasis or symbol, suggests to the author the image of the seven lamps placed before the throne, and which represented the septuple manifestation of the divine Spirit found by Jewish theology in Isaiah.† A choir of angels, who rank highest, surround the

*Ezekiel 1 and 10. †Isaiah 11 : 2.

throne; their number represents the twenty-four orders of priests, officiating in the terrestrial sanctuary, (chap. iv).

Before God is a book, sealed with seven seals: it is the book of the future. No man is able to open it. One single Being will succeed in so doing: it is Christ, both the first-born of creation and the son of David, who here appears under the figure of a Lamb, bearing both the marks of his immolation, and (in the symbol of the seven horns and seven eyes) the seal of the fulness of the Spirit of God dwelling in him. It is therefore Christ who will reveal futurity, and the prophet will be admitted to contemplate the spectacle of these revelations. The Lamb seizes the book, and instantly the cherubim, the archangels, and innumerable choirs of creatures, of all ranks and places, are singing hymns of praise, (chap. v).

The first four seals are successively opened, and the forerunners of the parousia, viz., the calamities which are to afflict mankind in the last time, appear. These are four figures, riding on four horses,* and representing† *conquest*, *war*, *famine* and *pestilence*, signalized by symbolical attributes, which can very easily be deciphered. These four figures are followed by another, which serves, as it were, to concentrate the divers features of this picture, the personified *Sheol*, ready to ingulf the numberless victims of these four scourges, (chap. 6 : 1—8).

At the opening of the fifth seal, there appear the martyrs, who want their blood avenged. They are answered that they should be patient until their brethren, whom the same fate awaited, have undergone it in their turn. The tribulations of the faithful have, consequently, not yet come to their end, (chap. 6 : 9—11).

The opening of the sixth seal, is followed by fearful phenomena in the heavens, by eclipses and the fall of stars.‡

---

*See Zechariah 1 and 6.

†According to Jeremiah 21 : 7; 32 : 36.

‡Joel 2 : 10; 3 : 4; Isaiah 34 : 4, etc.

The great of this world begin to tremble and to anticipate the effects of God's wrath,* (chap. 6 : 12—17).

The spectator is also waiting with anxiety for the opening of the last seal, which is to bring about the consummation of all things; but his expectation is not immediately satisfied. An intermediate scene, and interlude, delay the denouement. A solemn silence takes place in the whole universe, and an angel marks with God's seal the faithful, in order that they may not be involved in the catastrophe with which the wrath of the Supreme Judge is prepared to visit the world. These faithful, whose number is not ascertainable by the human eye, but revealed by the angel to the prophet, are God's true people, the spiritual Israel, the twelve tribes of which represent ideally all nations, among which Christ has disciples. From this moment they are exempt from the tribulations of the world, (chap. 7).

At last the seventh seal is opened, but instead of directly bringing about the end, it presents to us a new series of scenes, introduced by seven angels provided with trumpets, and whose revelations are to form, in their ensemble, the contents of this seventh seal. The prayers of the saints before God's throne, are burnt before him as incense; they are immediately heard, and, in consequence, the angel calls upon the earth the embers of the censer, an emblem of the chastisements which are reserved to the persecutors, (chap. 8 : 1—5).

The first four angels sound their trumpets. They form, by the scenes which they announce, a picture corresponding to that of the first four seals. The universe (earth, sea, rivers and heaven) is smitten with plagues similar to the plagues of Egypt,† which destroy the third part of creatures. These four trumpets are separated from those that follow, and thus more closely connected among themselves (like the first four seals), by a peculiar figure, that of an angel flying through the

---

*Isaiah 2 : 10; Hosea 10 : 8; Malachi 3 : 2, ect.

†Exodus 7 : 20; 9 : 23; 10 : 21; Jeremiah 51 : 25.

midst of heaven and announcing the last three trumpets, (chap. 8 : 6—13).

The fifth and sixth trumpets cause even more fearful chastisements. The two scourges peculiar to the East, the locust and the simoom, are introduced in bold descriptions. which surpass all that the imagination of the ancient prophets had depicted. Thousands of men are destroyed by these plagues, the others suffer the most excruciating torment, but do not repent, (chap. 9).

The world is therefore ripe for the judgment of the seventh trumpet, which, however, does not sound immediately. But, according to the symmetrical arrangement of the scenes, a new interlude follows, as after the opening of the sixth seal. This interlude has a double aim. In the first place, and in view of the magnitude of the things which remain to be revealed, the prophet is prepared for their understanding by a kind of special initiation. The reader shares the impression which this imposing solemnity* is about to produce, and his impatient attention increases in direct ratio of the delays which interfere with the denouement, (chap. 10).

In the second place, this delay is used to prepare a retreat for the elect, who, during the first interlude, had received the seal of God. This retreat is to be in the sacred inclosure of the temple of Jerusalem, which alone will be preserved from the conquest and profanation with which the heathen threaten the remainder of the city. These will remain master of it for three years and a half.† During this time, Moses and Elias, the forerunners of the Messiah, will preach to the people, but the Antichrist will kill them. Their resurrection will be the signal of the beginning of the catastrophe. The city will be partly destroyed by an earthquake, seven thousand men will perish, but the mass of the Jews will be converted in this supreme moment, (chap. 11 : 1—14).

Finally, the seventh angel sounds his trumpet, and celestial songs celebrate in advance the victory of God and Christ

---

*Compare Ezekiel 3; Ps. 29.

†Daniel 7 : 25; 12 : 7.

in the decisive conflict which is about to be waged. The heaven is opened, and the ark of the covenant, the symbol of reconciliation, formerly lost in the conflagration of the temple of Solomon, reappears, (chap. 11 : 15—19).

All that follows will consequently be the contents of the seventh trumpet. We know in advance that the contest of Christ against the powers hostile to his kingdom and to its victorious establishment, will be fought. But we will not see immediately this unparalleled struggle. The denouement is once more deferred by a description of the enemies, and by a prophetic prelude.

The adversaries are three in number. The first and the chief, is the devil; he appears under the figure of a serpent, ready to devour a new-born child. This is the symbolical representation of the idea that the devil is the bitter enemy of Christ and his Church. But the child is safe with God; and his mother, the Church of the true Israel, the Church of believers, is carried away towards the desert, to be sheltered there from the persecutions of the devil during three years and a half, that is to say, as long as the power of the latter shall last. The Church herself is out of danger, but her children are incessantly exposed to the attacks of the fiend during this last period, (chap. 12 : 1—17).

The second enemy emerges from the depth of the ocean, as a monster with seven heads, one of which has been mortally wounded, but is now healed. The devil gives to him his power for forty-two months longer, and the monster is worshiped by men, and full of fury against the faithful. This is the Roman empire, with its first seven emperors, one of which has been killed, but is about to revive as Antichrist (see chap. 17). The main part of the imagery is borrowed from Daniel (chap. 12 : 18; 13 : 10).

The third adversary, likewise represented as a monster, is false prophetism, which seduces men and leads them to worship the first beast (chap. 13 : 11—17).

In the last verse of chapter 13, the author, by an enigmatical formula, points out the historical name of the Antichrist. This verse is therefore, as it were, the key of the whole book,

and the explanation given of it will always be the test of any system of apocalyptical interpretation. This point being quite important and generally misunderstood, we will make it the subject of our investigation; but, in order not to interrupt our summary exposition, we refer our readers to the note at the bottom of the page.*

---

*To relate all the absurdities, which divines have told about the number 666 of the Apocalypse, would be a very curious history. This is not the place to do so; and, generally, to amuse one's self with refuting palpable errors or ridiculous hallucinations is wasting one's time. Our texts are so clear for any person, who wants to see and to comprehend, that the mere assertion of their true meaning must immediately dispel the clouds accumulated around them by dogmatical prejudice, preconceived notions, nay, even political preoccupations.

The number of the beast, 666, is the number of a man, ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου, says the prophet. He adds, moreover, that it is the number of a name; and this name is inscribed on the foreheads of all of those who are the devoted subjects, the worshipers of the beast. But the beast itself is a personal being, the Antichrist, and does not represent any abstract idea. The consequence of all this is, that the number 666 does not indicate a period of the history of the Church, as the self-styled orthodox interpretation of Lutheran divines and pietistic chiliasts of Bengel's school maintain it. It does not indicate a common name, designed to characterize a power, an empire, for instance Roman paganism, as Irenæus maintained it with his Λατεῖνος, to which all interpreters have since clung, who did not know how to invent something still more inadmissible, and of which Protestants have taken advantage in the interest of their anti-papal polemics. The terms *Latium*, *Latini*, existed in the first century only in poetry and in the local geography of the campaign of Rome, and even as the name of a language they were unknown to the apostles (Luke 23 : 38; John 19 : 20).

The number 666 must therefore contain a proper name, the name of a historical and political personage, who was to play the part of the Antichrist in the last revolutions which the Judæo-Christian world awaited. Whoever has read Daniel and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, knows who is meant, and, moreover, our author tells us the name of the person.

The following is the difficulty (if it is one) which has most frequently led astray even persons who approached the problem with an unprejudiced mind. The beast of the twelfth chapter is not an individual, but the Roman empire, considered as a power. The author himself tells us (chap. 17) that the seven heads of this beast represent the seven hills on which

The description of the three adversaries is followed by what we have called the prophetical prelude of the contest: first the reader is tranquilized about the fate of the elect during these gigantic struggles. They are sheltered in Sion, in immediate intercourse with the Lamb and the celestial choirs (chap. 14 : 1—5).

---

its capital is built, and also the seven kings who have reigned or will still reign there. This is very true, but he tells us just as explicitly that this beast is at the same time one of the seven heads, a combination apparently inconceivable, and more than paradoxical; and, notwithstanding, very natural, yea, necessary. The notion of a power, of a tendency, above all of a hostile one, becomes in the end always concrete, personified in the minds of people. The ideal monster becomes an individual. The principle becomes incarnate in a conspicuous man, and under this personal form the notion becomes popular, until, in turn, the individual becomes the permanent representative of an idea or tendency which outlives him. For most men a proper name is more expressive than a definition; the feelings and passions feed on it more easily. The heathen power, idolatry, blasphemy, persecution, all that arouses the legitimate antipathies of the Church, all that fills her with horror and makes her utter curses, become individualized, concentrated in the person of him who, a few years before the destruction of Jerusalem, had been guilty of all these crimes. Yes, the beast is, at the same time, both the empire and the emperor, and the name of the latter is on the lips of the intelligent reader, ere we utter it. But we wish to throw upon this subject all the light that historical science affords.

The attentive reader of the eleventh chapter, cannot but be convinced that the book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. The Temple and its interior yard, with its high altar, are measured, that is to say, (Zech. 2) destined to be preserved, while the remainder of the city is abandoned to the heathen, and devoted to profanation. These lines cannot have been written in view of the state of things such as existed after the year 70. But the indications of chapter seventeenth, are still more precise. We shall affirm that the city of Rome is spoken of, until we are shown another city, of the apostolic age, built on seven hills, *urbem septicollem*, which had been drenched with the blood of martyrs. (v. 6, 9). This city, or empire, has seven kings. The apocalypses of Daniel, Enoch, and Ezra, pursue the same chronological method, in counting likewise series of kings to set the reader right in reference to dates. Five of these seven kings have already died (v. 10); the sixth is reigning at the very moment. The sixth emperor of Rome is Galba, a man seventy-three years old when he ascended the throne. The catastrophe, in which the city and empire are

The prelude itself is composed of three scenes. In the first place three angels appear to make prophetical proclamations. The first announces the eternal judgment, and this is, as it were, a last warning addressed to the world. The second foretells the fall of Rome. The third, finally threatens

---

to be destroyed, will take place in three years and a half, as before declared. For this only and simple reason, the series of the emperors will have but one more after him who is then reigning, and this one will reign but a short time. The author does not know him, but he knows the relative duration of his reign, because he knows definitely that Rome will perish in three years and a half, not to rise again.

Afterwards an eighth emperor will come, who is one of the seven, and who is, at the same time, the beast that was, but is not at this moment. John means, consequently, one of the preceding emperors, who will come a second time, but as Antichrist, that is to say, invested with all the power of the demon, and with the special intent to make war on the Lord. As it is said that he is not at this time, but was already, he, therefore, must be one of the first five. He has received a deadly wound in times of old (chap. 13 : 3), so that his coming back is somewhat miraculous. It is therefore neither Augustus, nor Tiberius, nor Claudius, none of whom lost his life by a violent death, and of whom, moreover, no body will think, because not hostile to the Church. This last argument will also exclude Caligula. There remains but Nero, and all circumstances combine to point him out as the personage so mysteriously designated. As long as Galba was reigning, and long afterwards, people did not believe Nero dead; he was said to be somewhere concealed, and prepared to come back to avenge himself on his enemies. The Messianic notions of the Jews, of which a vague knowledge had reached the West, according to the testimony of Tacitus and Suetonius, commingled with these expectations and suggested to credulous persons the opinion that Nero would return from the East to conquer his throne with the assistance of the Parthians. Several false Neros presented themselves (Suetonius, Ner., 40, 57; Tacitus, Hist. I, 2; II, 8, 9; Dio Cassius LXIV, 9; Zonaras, Vita Tit., p. 578; Dio Chrys, Or. 20, p. 371, D.). These popular fancies spread also among Christians. The apocalypses refer incessantly to them (Visio Jesaj. Æthiopica; Libri Sibyll. IV, 116; V, 33; VIII, 1—216) and the Fathers of the Church attest that, for several centuries, they were not forgotten (Sulpic. Sever., II, 367; August., Cir. Dei XX, 19; Lactant., Mort. persec. c. 2; Hieron, ad Dan. XI, 28; ad Esaj. XVII, 13; Chrysost. ad 2 Thess. II, 7).

Finally, to render our proofs more conclusive, we remark that the name of Nero is, so to say, written at full length in our book. It is contained in the number 666. The mechanism of the problem reposes on one of the

the perverse with God's wrath, and comforts the faithful with the prospect of rest after all their tribulations* (chap. 14 : 6—13).

This three-fold direct proclamation is, in the second place, followed by a three-fold prophetical symbol of the judgment. The figures of the pruning knife, the sickle and the wine-press,† represent the divine chastisements, and more particularly the slaughter of an exterminatory battle (chap, 14 : 14—20).

At last, there appear, in the third scene of the prelude, seven angels holding seven vials filled with the plagues of divine wrath, and prepared to pour them out on the world.

---

cabalistical contrivances used in Jewish hermeneutics, and which consists in calculating the numerical value of the letters of which a word is composed. This proceeding, called *ghematria*, or geometrical, *i. e.*, mathematical, and used by the Jews in the interpretation of the Old Testament has given much trouble to our scholars, and led them into a labyrinth of errors. All ancient and modern alphabets, all imaginable combinations of numbers and letters have been tried. It is known that interpreters have believed, and sincerely maintained, that nearly all the historical names of the past eighteen centuries have been pointed out by this number. They have severally found in it Titus Vespasianus, and Simon Gioras, Julianus the Apostate, and Genseric, Mahomet, and Luther, Benedict IX. and Louis XV., Napoleon I. and the Duke of Reichstadt; and we could enjoy ourselves in finding the names of cotemporaries, yea, our own. After all, the enigma was not so difficult, though exegesis has solved it only in our day. I can claim the honor of having first found the solution, although several German scholars have found it soon after me, and without knowing my solution. The *Ghematria* is a Hebrew art. It is by the Hebraic alphabet that the meaning of the number will be found. One will read נרון קסר, Neron Cæsar: נ 50+ר200+ו6+נ50+ק100+ס60+ר200=666. It is most remarkable that there exists a very old manuscript which substitutes the number 616 for 666. This reading must proceed from a Latin reader of the Apocalypse, who also had found the solution, but who pronounced *Nero* as the Romans did, while the author pronounced *Neron* with the Greeks and the Orientals. By cutting off the final Nun, the name has only a numerical value of 616.

*For the figures, see Isaiah 21 : 9; Jeremiah 25 : 15 f ; 7, etc.

†Joel 4 : 13; Isaiah 17 : 5; 63 : 3.

The solemnity of this spectacle is still enhanced by a preparatory song (chap. 15).

The first four angels pour their vials upon the four parts of the apocalyptic universe, viz., *earth*, *sea*, *rivers* and *heavens*.‡ This picture is again closed and summed up, like that of the first four seals, and that of the first four trumpets, by the description of the effects which the plagues produce on men. They persist in their unbelief and blasphemies (chap. 16 : 1—9).

The fifth angel pours his vial on Rome, whose torments begin at this moment. The sixth angel pours his vial in the Euphrates, and dries it up to prepare the way for the eastern hosts, which the emperor, Antichrist, leads against Rome that rejected him. The constant symmetry of the poem brings again an interlude, in which unclean spirits, symbolized by the figures of three frogs, are about to gather, under the command of the devil, of the Antichrist and of false-prophetism, the kings of the earth, in order to engage in the last contest. The appointed place is Mount Tabor, which towers over the plain of Megiddo, the old battle-field of Israel.§ After that only the seventh angel pours out his vial into air, and a celestial voice announces to the world that all delay is past. The prelude is concluded. The action begins (chap. 16 : 10—18).

Again, this action is three-fold; the struggle between the two engaged powers, namely, *heaven* and *hell*, which contend for the empire of the world, is subdivided into three contests, or partial encounters, each of which is followed by a victory of the good cause. The first battle will be fought against Rome, but Heaven scorns to be defiled by a direct contact with the impure prostitute, the modern Babylon. She will be chastised by the king whom she has rejected, by Nero, who has become the Antichrist. After his return with eastern

‡Compare Apocalypse 8 : 7 ff.

§Zech. 12 : 11; compare Judges 4 : 5; 2 Kings 23 : 29.

armies, he will slaughter the inhabitants of his capital and reduce her to ashes (chap. 17).

The fall of Rome is the object of divers manifestations. On the one side, three angels proclaim it solemnly, the first to say that she will be deserted,* the second to warn the faithful not to suffer themselves to be enveloped in her dreadful destruction,† the third to show symbolically the eternity of her condemnation.‡ On the other side, the men who had been the friends of Rome bewail her fate. Three classes of these are pointed out, the *vassal kings*, who held their power from the empire; the *merchants*, who had grown rich by the luxury of the capital; finally, the *seamen* and *shipowners*, who trafficked with her§ (chap. 18).

But heaven and the elect praise God's justice, and rejoice that thereby he has given the first pledge of the approaching establishment of his kingdom (chap. 19 : 1—10).

The second battle is fought by the Antichrist and the Lord. The latter appears triumphantly upon a white horse, surrounded by heavenly hosts. His sword is his irresistible and victorious word. An angel calls the birds of prey, which are to devour the enemies.‖ The victory is so certain and so easy that the prophet does not even describe it. The monster and its associate are thrown into the lake of fire, their satellites perish by the sword of the conqueror (chap. 19 : 11—21).

In consequence of this second conflict, Satan is bound for a thousand years in the bottomless pit (chap. 20 : 1—3).

The happy result of this second battle, is the first resurrection, that of the martyrs, who will reign a thousand years with the Son of God, and thus will enjoy a privilege to the exclusion of all other dead (chap. 20 : 4—6).

Finally, the third and last battle takes place. After the thousand years have expired, Satan, loosed from his prison,

---

*5 : 2; cf. Isaiah 8 : 21; 34 : 11, 12; Jerem. 50 : 39.

†5 : 4; cf. Jerem. 50 : 15; 51 : 9; Isaiah 47 : 8.

‡5 : 21; cf. Jerem. 51 : 63.

§5 : 9, 11, 17; cf. Isaiah 23; Ezek. 27.

‖Ezek. 39 : 17.

is about to stir up anew the nations against the city of the elect. He finds satellites at the extremity of the earth,* but his army is destroyed by fire from heaven, and he is finally cast into hell (chap. 20 : 7—10).

Victory is immediately transformed into judgment. It is the final judgment, preceded by the universal resurrection of those who had not participated in the millennium. Their fate is dependent on their works, all of which are recorded in God's books, and according to the book of life. A part of them are reserved for bliss, the others are cast into everlasting fire (chap. 20 : 11—15).

At last the period of the second age of the world begins for the former, that of the kingdom of endless blessedness. A new heaven, a new earth, and on the latter a new Jerusalem, are prepared for them, and the author exerts himself to his utmost to describe the splendor of the latter, and to this end he borrows partly the details from the old prophets (chap. 21, 22 : 5).

By comparing this analysis of the apocalypse with what we have said previously of the Judæo-Christian eschatology, one cannot but be convinced that the two pictures, the two series of dogmas, of prophecies, of hopes, coincide perfectly, and that persons have always been wrong in seeking in the Apocalypse for new and peculiar revelations nowhere else found. If it were indispensably necessary to explain this book by modern history, as most of the interpreters do, the same system must needs also be applied to other books of the New Testament. There are, indeed, in the Apocalypse a richer portraiture, more detailed descriptions, a more methodical *ensemble* in the ideas, but all that belongs to the form and not to the substance, and nothing authorizes us to believe that other Christians of that epoch, other apostles, in whose writings we find these views, would not, on occasion, have clothed them in similar forms. There are even in the Apocalypse very meagerly sketched scenes, as for instance that of

---

*Ezekiel 38, 39.

the resurrection, for which Ezekiel* already furnished all necessary materials.

These last remarks lead us to say a few words concerning the form of the book. The preceding analysis shows how ingenious and artificial it is. The nature of the subject required a series of successive pictures, an unbroken narration of the future events, we would fain say an apocalyptic epopee. The author was not satisfied with so simple a form. Without changing the simplicity of the ground-work, he has found means to vary the scenes, to sustain and to revive incessantly the impatient attention of the reader, by apparent delays and combinations, quite as interesting by their novelty as attractive by their symmetry. The future is contained in a book with seven seals; the last seal comprehends the seven trumpets; the last trumpet produces the seven vials of God's wrath; the last vial only brings on the end. In each of these three septenary evolutions, the first four scenes are closely connected by the natural relations of their contents, and separated from the others by a common and figurative conclusion. The fifth and the sixth follow them isolated, and are regularly separated from the seventh and the last by an interlude. Wherever the length of the scenes allowed subdivisions, they take place by trinal combinations. Thus, the seventh trumpet brings in succession the description of the enemies, the prophetical prelude, and the fight. The enemies are three in number, the prelude is triple, the contest is divided in three encounters or attacks. Each assault is divided into three phases, the struggle, the victory, and the result.

This series of eschatological pictures, is preceded by a prologue and followed by and epilogue, which are not the least important part of the book. They are in the most intimate connection with one another, especially by their form and imagery. The prologue, however, is more extensive and more interesting. It is composed of an inscription, accompanied

---

*Chap. 37.

by a sentence, which serves as a symbol or epigraph (chap. 1: 1—3), of a dedication (v. 4—8), and of a preparatory vision, in which the author makes the reader acquainted with his special mission (v. 9—20), which is essentially pastoral and apostolic. His object is not so much to make these revelations for themselves, as to make them serve to the strengthening and salvation of the Christians in Asia Minor. The instruction of the prophet is not destined to amuse the idle inquisitiveness of future generations, but to be applied to the most urgent wants in the then present circumstances. The author gives to his exhortations, which evidently refer to actual situations, perfectly known to him, the form of seven epistles, directed to the seven principal churches of proconsular Asia. Each one of these epistles uniformly begins with an address, and closes with a promise, which only differ in the form; the body of these epistles contains admonitions, which describe the individual state of each church. The formulas of the addresses recall the divers attributes of the Saviour, such as he has been described in the first chapter, the promises anticipate the description of the new Jerusalem. By assigning to these epistles their place at the beginning of the book, the author shows a poetical taste altogether superior. According to the prosaic and usual preaching, the moral and practical application is put after the exposition of the theory. There is, moreover, throughout the whole book, a train of sparkling sentences of the same kind, which everywhere draw the attention of the reader to the wants of the moment, and do not permit him to have his mind engrossed by the brilliant pictures of times to come.*

As for the peculiar coloring of all these tableaux, the kind of portraiture which we have before us, it would be highly improper to judge of it by the æsthetical principles of western literature. We cannot expect to find here the austere beauty and the plastic forms of classical poetry, and still less the picturesque gracefulness of modern romanticism. It is

---

*Chap. 6 : 9 ff; 13 : 9, 10; 14 : 4 ff; 12, 13; 16 : 15; 19 : 9; 20 : 6 ff.

the fervid breath of the East which animates this imagery; it is an unrestrained imagination, that sacrifices everywhere beauty to boldness, that braves all proportions to offer to the astonished gaze something most grand, most gigantic, at the risk of wounding good taste. It is a profusion of metaphors, a flood of figures, an endless gallery of bold prosopopæias, an incessant incarnation of ideas and abstractions; one might say, a burial ground, whence arise phantoms belonging to a foreign world, and inspiring now an indiscreet curiosity, now an inexpressible terror. With all that, the descriptions are not clear and precise; there is not a single one that may be reproduced by painting; the outlines of the images are vague and uncertain; the drapery is still more nebulous than clumsy, and all attempts of drawing or painting the scenes of the Apocalypse have been most signal failures, have produced mere caricatures. In reading this book we must always bear in mind, that we have to do with symbolized ideas, and not with photographs of nature. Moreover, nearly all these images, symbols and decorations, are borrowed from the old prophets, and the exceptions cannot be considered to be happy inventions. The author does himself, therefore, explain the latter, according to the example of Jeremiah and Amos, while the former, mostly borrowed from Ezekiel and Daniel, rarely need comment.

From all that we have said of the form of the Apocalypse, the literary studies which must have furnished its elements, the art visible in the symmetrical combinations of the scenes and their successive evolution, the connection of the different parts of the book, of which the author never lost sight, it results that we are under an absolute necessity to consider also the visions as a freely chosen form, and not to ascribe to them any historical objectivity. In truth, we also could speak of visions which the prophet has had, in so far as ardently cherished hopes become gradually so interwoven with our spiritual life, that they finally assume, in our imagination, an appearance of real existence, sometimes very strongly characterized. In this sense, visions are neither rare nor ex-

traordinary. But we will not resort to this subterfuge. It is not in this sense that traditional theology speaks of the visions of the Apocalypse. It maintains that the apostle has been entirely passive, in a state of ecstasy, which has permitted him to see only that which was invisible to the eyes of the body in their usual condition. According to this theology, he is considered merely the narrator of scenes which he has looked on, and to the composition of which his intellect has remained entirely foreign. We cannot adopt these views. The real and objective visions, those, for instance, spoken of in the history of Paul, are psychological phenomena of a character quite different—by their short duration, their concentred object, and the nature of the impression which they leave behind. Here, on the contrary, art, that is to say the subjective liberty of the mind, is the prevailing character of a long series of tableaux, which are fitted into one another with remarkable skill and taste. The more we study this book, the more we are compelled to admire the acuteness and application lavished upon the arrangement of the general plan, and the respective position of so many great and small pictures, which reveal a perfect order in their ensemble, where many people have only seen a chaos of grotesque forms, following one another at random, or fortuitously selected from among a great number of others that were discarded. The poetical and artificial meditation is quite as manifest as the identity of the substance of the prophecy with the popular beliefs prevalent at this epoch, and as God had evidently nothing to reveal to the prophet that the other apostles have not also known and described, the visions, in the theological meaning, were here quite as superfluous as psychologically they would be incomprehensible.

The history of Hebrew prophecy teaches us, moreover, that vision was for a long time its required and necessary form. The old prophets had been popular orators, and during centuries they could consider this means of communication sufficient. It was but very late, and gradually, that they became writers. As authors they preserved the peculiar form of their oral in-

struction. In the same manner as they had usually accompanied their discourses with symbolical acts, in order to arouse the attention of their audience and to impress more deeply upon the mind the explanations which they gave of them,* so they connected their written precepts with symbolical images, which formed, as it were, their text. These images were, at first, as simple as possible,† and such as to make us understand that they must be interpeted by eastern rhetoric, and not by psychology or theology. Later, this peculiar form of thought prevailed over all others. Ezekiel and Zechariah know scarcely any other; it was especially applied to apocryphal prophecies, and so we find it here; not as an innovation, still less as a personal privilege, but as a national inheritance, as a literary condition.

---

*1 Kings 11 : 29ff; 22 : 11; Isaiah 20; Jeremiah 27, etc.

†Jeremiah 1 : 11, 13; 24 : 1; Amos 7 : 1; 8 : 1, etc.

ARTICLE IV.

CHURCH PROBLEMS SOLVED BY HISTORY.*

By Rev. F. W. Conrad, D. D., Philadelphia.

The Historical Society of the Lutheran Church was formed about twenty-five years ago. Its primary object was the collection of all the records made in the rise and progress of the Lutheran Church in America, and the preservation of the material thus furnished for the future use of the historian.

Time is conditional to the formation of history. A period must be given for experience to develop events, before an account of them can be recorded, and afterwards digested and published. More than two centuries have passed since the Lutheran Church was transplanted from Europe to America, and half a century since the General Synod was organized, and, accordingly, we have just celebrated its semi-centennial anniversary.

Certain organic principles enter into the constitution of every religious denomination, upon the nature of which its character and progress depend. In the providence of God, different opinions have been entertained concerning these formative principles and their development, resulting in the origin of different denominations, and constituting their distinguishing characteristics. In this manner ecclesiastical problems have arisen, upon the proper solution of which depend the unity, harmony, co-operation and efficiency of each denomination in particular, as well as of the Church of Christ in general.

We may speak of the Lutheran Church of different eras, of various countries, and of particular organizations. In

---

* An Address delivered before the Historical Society of the Lutheran Church, at its meeting in Dayton, Ohio, June 15th, 1871, and published by request of the Society.

Europe she has passed through her formative era, the post-reformation era, the pietistic era, and is now in her unionistic era. In America she has passed through a period of synodical isolation, of general organization, and has recently entered upon a period of separation and reconstruction. In the reformation era, she solved the ecclesiastical problems presented to her, and during subsequent eras, that solution was examined and either endorsed or modified and readopted in Europe, or else disapproved and, either in part or in whole, rejected. The same thing has taken place in America. The Fathers of the American Lutheran Church, delivered from all governmental restraint, had the opportunity of re-examining the problems solved in the Reformation, and, approving of the elementary principles of church organization then adopted, they incorporated them, in their essential integrity, into the congregations and synods they organized, culminating eventually in the formation of the General Synod in 1821.

As in empyrical science, based upon the facts of consciousness, when the testimony of one consciousness differs from that of another, the appeal is made to the testimony of the general consciousness, so, too, when the fact is presented, that some theologians and individual Lutheran churches have decided ecclesiastical problems in one way, and others in another, the appeal is taken from the decisions of individuals and particular churches, to the general judgment of the Lutheran Church, and in this sense we shall speak of her in solving ecclesiastical problems.

The ultimate design of history is found in the valuable uses it can be made to subserve. The things that were written concerning those who lived aforetime, we are told in Holy Writ, were written for the learning of those who came after them; and, in like manner, historic facts have been recorded that those interested in them may profit by them. History, accordingly, furnishes the data for solving church problems.

A problem is any question involving doubt, and requiring some operation, experiment, or further evidence for its

solution. Church problems are not, consequently, axioms or self-evident truths, the simple presentation of which carries conviction to the mind; but they are questions which have necessarily arisen in the organization and progress of the Church, the evidence for the solution of which is furnished by experience as recorded in history. In other words, as ecclesiastical problems arise, history presents the data for their solution. The number of these problems might be called legion, but we must confine ourselves to the consideration of such only as involve the essential principles of all church organization, and which embrace the characteristics by which religious denominations are distinguised from each other. In the discussion of the theme: "Church Problems Solved by History," we shall first pass in review the problems solved by the Lutheran Church, and then present the governing principles by which she was directed in solving them.

I. PROBLEMS OF THE WORD.

"This is eternal life," said John, "to know thee and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." A true knowledge of God and his Christ is, consequently, indispensable to the attainment of eternal life. But as the world, left to the guidance of its own "wisdom, knew not God," a revelation from God, making himself known to man, became imperatively necessary to his highest well-being. Accordingly, God gave man such a revelation in the Holy Scriptures, which are adequate to direct him "in every good work," and "make him wise unto salvation." The original Scriptures, recorded by the "holy men of old, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," constitute the revelation of God in an uncorrupted form. In the course of time, many copies of the original text were transcribed, and various translations into different languages made. Through the carelessness of transcribers, and the mistakes of translators, various readings are found in the manuscripts, and the versions in the different languages vary from those in the Hebrew and the Greek. A special providence having watched over the original text, it has been preserved in its essential integrity. The first problems, therefore, which

the Lutheran Church was called upon to solve, had reference to the Word, and we present them in the following form: Where is the unadulterated Word to be found? Ought it to be circulated among the people? Is it the only medium of the Spirit?

The Romish Church adopted the Vulgate version of the Scriptures, appended the Apocrypha, and added tradition to both. The original Vulgate, made by Jerome (385), contained so many important discrepancies, that the charge of heresy and falsfication of Scripture was brought against him by Rufinus. Subsequently this defective translation was so greatly corrupted, that Charlemagne (802) ordered it to be revised by Alcuin, and compared with the old manuscripts and the Hebrew text; but, in spite of this and all other efforts made to improve the Vulgate, it remained a corrupt version of the Scriptures, and the translations made from it into the Germanic tongues, prior to the Reformation, were declared to be "abominable." The Apocrypha, destitute of canonical authority, abounds with absurdities, contradictions, and errors, and the traditions, unsustained by authentic testimony, became a collection of human inventions, imaginative legends, and lying fables.

The Lutheran Church excluded the Apocrypha from the sacred canon, discarded ecclesiastical tradition, passed by all translations, and proceeding to the purest version of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures extant, rendered them into the most accurate and faithful translations ever published, viz., the German translation made by Martin Luther.

If the knowledge of God be indispenable to man, and God has revealed himself in the Scriptures, then it follows, that if man is to come to the knowledge of the truth, the Bible must be placed in his hands. Prior to the Reformation, the copies of the Scriptures were so scarce and expensive, that no interdict to their circulation was necessary; and, hence, no formal one was issued by the Church of Rome. But when, through the invention of printing, their number was greatly multiplied and they became so cheap that even the poor could possess them, she manifested her indifference to the Scrip-

tures by making no adequate provision for the circulation of her own version, and interdicting the reading of that of the Protestants.*

The Lutheran Church, having drawn her doctrines from the Scriptures, appealed to them as the infallible standard by which their truthfulness was to be determined, and as an inspired apostle had inculcated the duty upon all, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," she insisted that the Bible should be placed into the hands of the laity, and all men permitted to examine it.

The Anabaptists separated the word and the Spirit, maintaining that the Holy Ghost, in producing his sanctifying effects, operated directly and independent of the external

---

**From the Preface to a Roman Catholic Edition of the New Testament,* with Annotations, printed at Rheims, by JOHN FOGNY, 1852, under the auspices and for the use of the R. C. College at Rheims.

"Whereupon the order, which many a wise man wished for before, was taken by the Deputies of the famous Council of Trent in this behalf, and confirmed by supreme authority, that the Holy Scriptures, though truly and catholicly translated into vulgar tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than such as have express license thereunto of their lawful ordinaries, with good testimonies from their curates or confessors, that they be humble, discreet and devout persons, and like to take much good, and no harm thereby."

"We must not imagine, either, that in the primitive Church, either every one that understood the learned tongues wherein the Scriptures were written, or other languages into which they were translated, might, without reprehension, read, reason, dispute, turn and toss the Scriptures; or that our forefathers suffered every schoolmaster, scholar, or grammarian that had a little Greek or Latin, straight to take in hand the Holy Testament. Or, that the translated Bible into the vulgar tongues was to be placed in the hands of every husbandman, artificer, apprentice boy and girl, mistress, maid, and man. Or, that they were to be sung, played, alleged by every tinker, taverner, rhymer and minstrel. Or, that they were intended for table-talk, for ale-benches, for boats and barges, and all other sorts of profane persons and company. No! In those better times men were neither so ill, nor so curious of themselves, so to abuse the blessed book of Christ, neither was there any such easy means, before printing was invented, as now there is, to disperse the copies into the hands of every man."

means. Accordingly, Munzer and his fanatical followers claimed that they had obtained a knowledge of God by an immediate illumination from heaven. Inflated with self-conceit, he and his associates led their followers into all manner of excesses. Motley in his introduction to *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, gives the following description of them. "The leaders were among the most depraved of human creatures, as much distinguished for their licentiousness, blasphemy and cruelty, as their followers for superstition. The Germans, Munzer and Hoffman, had been succeeded as chief prophets, by a Dutch baker, Matthiszoon, of Harlem, who announced himself as Enoch. Under the government of this prophet, the Anabaptists mastered the city of Munster. Here they confiscated property, plundered churches, violated females, murdered men who refused to join the gang, and, in brief, practiced all the enormities which humanity alone can conceive or perpetrate. On a cold winter's night seven men and five women, inspired by the Holy Ghost, threw off their clothes and rushed naked and raving through the streets of Amsterdam (Feb. 1535), shrieking, 'wo, wo, wo! the wrath of God, the wrath of God!' When arrested, they obstinately refushed to put on their clothing. 'We are,' they observed, 'the *naked* truth.'" Such were the people who dispensed with the written Word, considered the sacraments as mere husks, regarded the preaching of the gospel as foolishness, and inaugurated the higher dispensation of the Spirit.

The Lutheran Church, on the contrary, taught that the Holy Spirit produces his saving effects only through the Word and the sacraments. Her testimony is as follows:

"In regard to those points which concern the oral, external Word, we should maintain firmly, that God grants his Spirit or grace to no one, unless through or with the external Word previously delivered. Thus we shall fortify ourselves against the enthusiasts, who boast of being in possession of the Spirit without and prior to the Word, and accordingly judge, explain, and distort the Scripture, or oral Word, at their pleasure, as Munzer did, and many others still do at the present day, who wish to be acute judges between the spirit and the let-

ter, but who know not what they say or resolve. All this is the spirit of that ancient Satan, the serpent, who made enthusiasts of Adam and Eve, leading them from the external word to spirituality and self-conceit, and did it, however, also by external words, precisely as our enthusiasts condemn this external word, and yet they themselves do not keep silence, but fill the world with noisy controversy and contention, as if the Spirit could not come through the Scriptures, or the oral word of the apostles, but that through their word and their writings he must come. Why then do they not also omit preaching and writing themselves, till the Spirit himself enters into the people without and prior to their writing, as they boast that he entered into them, without the preaching of the gospel."

II. PROBLEMS OF THE CREED.

The Bible contains all the truth necessary for man to know. Its books were written by a number of authors at different times. Its truths are scattered over the entire field of revelation, and are presented in an unsystematic form. To obtain a correct and saving knowledge of what the Bible teaches, it becomes necessary to collect the principle truths it contains, and arrange them in systematic order. Such a statement becomes a "form of sound words," and is called a creed. Many such creeds have been prepared in different ages, giving rise to confessional problems, such as: Are creeds necessary? What should they contain? How ought they to be subscribed?

The Liberals and Radicals have maintained that creeds are unnecessary, and that the Bible alone should constitute the creed of the Church. In theory, this sounds specious; in practice, it has proved Utopian. In consequence of the various forms in which the truths of the Bible are expressed, and the deterioration of the human reason, multitudes have entirely misapprehended the teachings of the Scriptures, perverted even their fundamental doctrines, and wrested from them by exegetical violence damnable heresies, denying even the Lord that bought them.

Accordingly, the Lutheran Church maintained that creeds were necessary, as the depository of the testimony of God's people to the orthodox system of doctrine taught in his word, as a barrier to the introduction of heresy, as a safeguard to sound doctrine, and as an incentive to cordial co-operation.

The Extreme Symbolists, regarding unity of sentiment on all points of doctrine as necessary to church-fellowship, have prepared creeds of great length, containing detailed and intricate statements of both essential and non-essential truths, as well as specific testimonies against all forms and phases of error. And to these creeds, formed after the ideal of an exhaustive, polemic theological discussion, they have required an unconditional subscription, according to their letter and spirit.

The Lutheran Church, in her formative period, received the œcumenical creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, handed down by the ancient Church, but, as experience had shown that they were not sufficient to prevent the introduction of heresy and of ecclesiastical corruption, she prepared the Augsburg Confession, and presented it at first as an exhibition of the doctrines and principles she believed the Scriptures to reveal, and as a testimony against the errors and abuses which the Romish Church had promulgated and fostered, and afterwards adopted it as her creed. It presents the doctrines of Christianity in a generic form, and its twenty-one articles constitute the master-piece among confessional writings. The subscription required involves the belief of the cardinal or fundamental doctrines set forth in it, and the approval of its ecclesiastical principles.

III. PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION.

Through the revelation of Jesus Christ, and the preaching of his apostles, accompanied by the Holy Spirit, individual believers were multiplied. Remaining in isolation from each other, their Christian graces could not be fully developed, and each believer could accomplish but little while he remained separate from his brethren. Organization, consequently, became a necessity in attaining the highest excel-

lence of character, and the greatest usefulness in life. Accordingly, as converts were made, they were immediately added to the Church, and, in this manner, churches were established in the places visited by the apostles in Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome.

Through the blinding influence of depravity, an impure version of Scripture, human tradition, Jewish inoculations, heathen practices, and state control, the Church was corrupted and a reformation became indispensable. The Romish Church had, in this manner, departed so far from the primitive model, that Luther and his followers were compelled to solve problems of organization, such as: Can the Romish Church be thoroughly reformed? Is it necessary to separate from her communion? Must a new Church be organized?

Believing with the Fathers "in one holy, catholic Church," the reformers were loath to withdraw from the visible body which claimed that appellation, and labored at first to reform it. Their efforts resulted in the exposure of the depth and extent of the heresy and impurity prevailing in it, as well as of the arrogant pretensions of the Pope, and his unwillingness, either to correct errors in doctrine, or reform evils in practice. Convinced, at last, that the Pope was Antichrist, and the organization of which he was the acknowledged head, "the mother of abominations," they abandoned the hope of reforming her, came out from her, and organized another Church.

In the accomplishment of this delicate and momentous task, the reformers did not establish a new Church. Apprehending the true elements of church organization revealed in the Bible, tracing their development in the primitive Church, and sifting them from the wood, hay, and stubble, with which the Roman hierarchy had mixed them, they adopted them as the organic principles of ecclesiastical organization, and combining them in systematic order, formed the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Accordingly, they declare in their public confession, that they have retained nothing in their congregations, "either in doctrine or ceremonies, contrary to the

Holy Scriptures, or opposed to the universal Christian Church, or to the Romish Church, so far as may be observed from the writings of the Fathers." They did not originate a sect, by a schismatic separation, but they re-organized and perpetuated the primitive and apostolic, holy, catholic Church.

IV. PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT.

As the individual believer cannot attain his highest ends, dissociated from his fellows, neither can the congregation attain the ultimate ends of organization, viz., spiritual culture, the supply of the morally destitute, and the conversion of the world, while remaining in a state of isolation and independence. This gives rise to problems in ecclesiastical government, such as: Is church government necessary? Which is the best system?

In nature, every atom and world, every plant and animal, is placed under government, and constrained by physical forces to obey the laws of its constitution. In the family, every child is subjected by birth to the authority of the parent, and obligated to obey the rules of the household. In the state, every citizen becomes subject to government, whose rulers he is bound to honor, and whose statutes he is obligated to obey. And, in like manner, God, in ordaining "governments" for man, has provided a government for the regulation of the conduct and efforts of both individual believers and congregations, as component parts of the spiritual kingdom of Christ.

To attain the highest ends of government, individuals must be organized into congregations, congregations into synods, and synods into general bodies. Formulas of discipline and government must be adopted, defining the rights, prerogatives and obligations of the integral parts of such general organizations. In this manner provision is made to secure such a degree of unity in doctrine, uniformity in practice, and homogeneity in character, as is indispensable to harmonious development, cordial co-operation, and ecclesiastical progress.

Erastians and Radicals repudiate all systems of Church

government, and permit every professor of religion to believe, teach, and do whatsoever he pleases, unrestricted by creed, and unrebukable by discipline. They maintain the monstrous position, that while God has ordained governments for the restraint of self-will in the family, and for the subjection of the individual choice to the general welfare in the state, he has failed to make similar provision for the government of the believer in the Church. In other words, that anarchy is the normal state of man in the kingdom of Christ, and that his highest spiritual development is to be attained while an ecclesiastical antinomian and religious outlaw.

Popery, on the other hand, has gone to the opposite extreme, established a hierarchy in which the Pope of Rome is invested with supreme power, both temporal and spiritual, and ministers, members, and congregations subjected to an absolute ecclesiastical despotism.

The Lutheran Church in Europe, while she apprehended and confessed the true principles of Church Government revealed in the Scriptures, found herself trammeled by the State in carrying them out, but, released from all political control in the United States, she has adopted an eclectic system, according to which the voice of the individual is heard in the congregation, the voice of the congregation in the synod, and the voice of the synod in the General Synod. And while, according to this system, each member, congregation, and synod, is represented in the General Synod, so, too, has each member solemnly obligated himself to obey those placed over him in the congregation, each congregation pledged itself to carry out the action of the synod to which it belongs; and each synod bound itself to respect the recommendations, and execute the behests of the General Synod.

V. PROBLEMS OF WORSHIP.

Worship is a capacity of the finite rational spirit. It consists in the apprehension, contemplation, and adoration of the Infinite. It is rational when offered by the unregenerate; it is spiritual when indited by the Holy Ghost. Its matter is

truth, its effect upon the true worshiper sanctifying. Worship may be sent to heaven as the inarticulate breath of thought generated in the devout heart of the saint, and it may also clothe itself in words, and find appropriate expression in language. The former constitutes its essence, the latter its form. As form is essential to the manifestation of substance in nature, so is form indispensable to the manifestation of worship in the Church. All audible worship, whether prayer or praise, must, therefore, assume form. In praise, as no man is capable of composing hymns extemporaneously, worship always follows the written form of poetry, borne on the wings of melody to the ear of God. In prayer, worship may either assume form as it emanates spontaneously from the Christian's heart in the words he utters, or else in the repetition of the language expressive of his desires prepared for his devotional use. Problems have consequently arisen relative to the ordering of public worship, such as: Ought all forms of worship to be excluded from the Church, and none but extemporaneous prayers be offered by the clergyman? Ought no extemporaneous prayer to be allowed, and all public worship be conducted according to a prescribed liturgy? Or may both modes of worship be advantageously combined in the devotional exercises of the sanctuary?

The Romish Church, discarding free prayer, multiplied her forms of worship, incorporated into them many errors, culminating in the long, complicated, tedious, and superstitious service of the Mass. Erring in regard to the manner in which worship produces its sanctifying effects, viz., through the truth apprehended and expressed by the worshiper, she conducted her service in Latin, and made its observance a meritorious performance, producing saving results *ex opere operato.* The Episcopal, and some other Protestant Churches, while they have rejected many of the parts contained in the Mass, have nevertheless, followed her liturgical example, excluded extemporaneous prayer, and conducted public worship only according to prescribed forms.

The Puritan Churches have gone to the opposite extreme. Regarding forms of prayer as injurious to the true spirit of

devotion, they have opposed their use, and conducted all their religious services extemporaneously and without any liturgical forms.

The Lutheran Church, as is her wont, took the medium position. Holding the universal priesthood of believers, she regarded the ministry, as well as the laity, capable of making extemporaneous prayers, and hence, allowed and encouraged it. In this way, she made provision for presenting the various wants of the people, in their constantly changing circumstances, to the Giver of every perfect gift, on each Lord's Day. But as there exist certain general wants, felt by all believers in their approach to God, and as the desires prompted by them have found clear, beautiful, and devotional expression in certain forms of confession, profession, and adoration, prepared in the early centuries, tested through ages, and found spiritually edifying by millions in all lands, she selected a sufficient number of the best, incorporated them into a short, scriptural, and devotional order of worship, and recommended its use to the churches. Among the parts thus distinguished by our Church, and finding place in her order of worship, we mention, 1. The Introit; 2. The Gloria Patri; 3. The Confession of Sin; 4. The Kyrie; 5. The Apostles' Creed; 6. The Gloria in Excelsis. These forms were placed by Luther in his first liturgy, the Formula Missæ, in 1523, and followed by the Churches of the Reformation. They are found in Muhlenberg's liturgy, adopted by the Synod of Pennsylvania in 1748. They are retained in most of the older, as well as modern, liturgies of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and in all the later liturgies adopted by all the General Lutheran bodies in this country, viz.: in that of the General Synod, South, the General Council, and the General Synod, North. These forms of worship were used by the Church of Rome; they are, however, not Romish in their origin, but come down to us from catholic, as distinguished from Romish, antiquity. Neither is their use in public worship confined to the Lutheran Church. They found a place in the liturgies of the Reformed Churches of Europe, and of the Moravian and Episcopal Churches of Europe and Amer-

ica. And so untenable is the extreme unliturgical position, and so unsatisfactory worship destitute of all devotional forms, that voices in the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Methodist Churches have been heard, calling for a moderate liturgical service in connection with free prayer; and there are ministers and congregations in each of them, where such forms have been introduced, and are used and enjoyed by the people. Another illustration, proving that the moderate liturgical position adopted by the Lutheran Church three and a half centuries ago, has stood the test of ages, and commanded the approval of the vast majority of the Protestant world.

VI. PROBLEMS OF RITES.

A rite is a religious ceremony, setting forth the manner in which divine ordinances are to be observed, and solemn services conducted, as prescribed either by law, precept, or custom. As form is inseparable from public worship, so are rites essential to ecclesiastical culture. Such rites were, accordingly, instituted by Jehovah, both in the patriarchal and the Mosaic dispensations. They constitute a distinct form of revelation, and a peculiar mode of exhibiting truth and imparting instruction. The principal rites, forming the distinguishing characteristic of the Jewish economy, are included under types, symbols, and memorials. As types, they revealed Christ, the sacrificial offering of God, and Saviour of the world; as symbols, they prefigured the atoning work of the Redeemer; and as memorials, they commemorated significant acts and important events. The manner in which they attain their end, is by typifying, symbolizing, and recalling truth. They thus became important media of knowledge, means of grace, and incentives to obedience. As peculiar to the Mosaic, and designed to introduce the Christian dispensation, they have passed away and lost their sinificance, but as illustrating the wisdom of God in instituting religious rites, and in inaugurating the symbolic mode of instruction for the cultivation of piety, they are worthy of profound study.

As man's spiritual wants remain the same, as God is unchangeable, and as the Church is one, it is not probable that so important an instrumentality as religious rites was introduced arbitrarily, and, having subserved a temporary purpose, would never be employed again. On the contrary, it is much more reasonable to believe, that, as a mode of imparting religious instruction, they are founded upon the fitness of things, and would, consequently, be introduced into the Christian Church. And the deductions of reason have been corroborated by the New Testament records of fact. The Old Testament dispensation had its circumcision, the New has "the circumcision made without hands," even Baptism: the Old had its Passover, the New has Christ, our Passover slain for us, in the Lord's Supper. Did the Mosaic rites, as "shadows" and "figures," symbolize the "substance" of the "true" verities—Baptism is also declared to be a "figure" of the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and is said thus to save us. Did the Jews, by the celebration of the Passover, prefigure the slaying of the Lamb of God; the Christians, in celebrating the Lord's Supper," do show the Lord's death till he come." Did Israel commemorate great events, and typify redemption blessings in the observance of memorial feasts; the Christian is commanded to commemorate the crucifixion of Christ, as a world-redeeming fact, and assured that the New Testament Sabbath is the type of Heaven, the Rest that remains for the people of God, and that the Holy Supper is a type of the higher communion which Christ will celebrate with his followers in heaven forever. Problems have, accordingly, arisen concerning religious rites, such as: What rites did Christ institute? Has the Church authority to institute others? How do they produce their saving results?

The Romanists increased the number of the sacraments to seven, adding to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, absolution, confirmation, ordination, marriage, and extreme unction. The bishops claimed the right to institute religious rites at will, and without any warrant from the Holy Scriptures. In its exercise, heathen customs, Jewish ceremonies, and human

ordinances were multiplied beyond measure, and the simplicity of the gospel transformed into a pompous, tedious, and superstitious round of will worship. Perverting the true design of religious rites, and the manner in which they produce their spiritual effects, they imposed their punctilious observance upon the people as necessary to obtain remission of sins and merit salvation, and taught that these results were produced, *ex opere operato*, "namely, that the mere use of the sacraments, the work performed, makes us just before God, and secures his grace, even without a good disposition of heart."

The Quakers, unable to discriminate between the true use and the abuse of forms, and not apprehending the real end of religious rites, as a divinely appointed means of instruction and spiritual culture, have not only discarded the use of all forms in worship, but likewise refused to observe the ordinances instituted by Jesus Christ, and practiced by his apostles. They have entirely misapprehended the teachings of the New Testament, and the force of the example of the primitive churches, and so spiritualized Christianity, as to represent it as a moving soul without a body; as a hidden, internal, spiritual essence, which is to be propagated without seeking expression in form, rites, and organization.

The Lutheran Church acknowledged Baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments, regarded them as efficacious signs of God's grace, as seals or confirmations of God's word, and as sure testimonies of his purpose of mercy towards us, and, hence, enjoined their perpetual observance. The manner in which they teach truth and confirm the word, she explains as follows: "As the word enters our ears, so the external signs are placed before our eyes, inwardly to excite and move the heart to faith. The word and the external signs work the same things in our hearts, as Augustine well says: 'The sacrament is a visible word,' for the external sign is like a picture and signifies the same thing that is preached by the word; both, therefore, effect the same thing." As the New Testament was not composed in the form of a ritual, setting forth the manner in which all religious rites were to be ob-

served, but contained certain principles, which, practically developed in external rites, would prove instructive and edifying, the Lutheran Church retained such rites, ceremonies and usages, as accorded with these scriptural principles, were consistent with the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and which experience had shown tended to impart useful knowledge and maintain good order and discipline in the congregation. Accordingly, she retained confession in the evangelical sense, confirmation in the reception of members, the observance of the cardinal festivals commemorative of the great facts in the history of the Saviour, together with liturgical forms, prayers, and hymns, used in the administration of baptism and the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

VII. PROBLEMS OF AGENCIES.

The matter of revelation is truth, its end the moral recovery of man. To attain its end, truth must be brought in contact with man. This may be done in various ways, and necessitates the origination of appropriate instrumentalities. This gives occasion to problems concerning agencies, such as: Are agencies, as mediums of communicating a knowledge of the truth, necessary? What agencies are best adapted to this purpose? By whom ought they to be employed?

The Romish Church, having erred in judgment concerning truth as the essential element of sanctification, and adopting the *opus operatum* view of the manner in which divine grace operates, undervalued the circulation of the Scriptures and the preaching of the gospel, and relied more on the magical effect of the sacraments. Misapprehending the true nature of the service of God as consisting in piety, and perverting it into a meritorious performance of legality, she originated agencies adapted to its attainment. Accordingly, popery has invented masses, vigils, pilgrimages, convents, nunneries, relics of saints, indulgences, penance, as means for promoting religion, but thereby cultivated the most absurd superstition, deluding the people and endangering their souls.

The Lutheran Church, in accordance with her convictions

concerning the divine word, has employed such agencies as were best adapted to make its truths known. Accordingly, she has made provision for circulating the Scriptures, established institutions to educate ministers, raised funds to aid indigent students, supported home and foreign missionaries, fostered Christian nurture through catechization and Sunday schools, established meetings for social prayer and instruction, encouraged special efforts for the conversion of sinners, extended aid in building houses of worship, founded and sustained eleemosynary institutions, and employed the press in issuing religious periodicals, and in publishing and circulating religious literature. In some cases these agencies have been originated and sustained by special associations within the Church, and, at other times, by the Church herself as an ecclesiastical organism.

VIII. PROBLEMS OF FELLOWSHIP.

Individuals constitute the component parts of congregations, congregations of local synods and synods, of general bodies. In their intercourse they associate with each other on equal terms, and enjoy ecclesiastical fellowship. The essential condition of such fellowship is unity of sentiment. This must embrace agreement in doctrine as well as the approval of the organic principles adopted by a Church in its organization. This becomes the occasion of the rise of problems concerning fellowship, such as: What degree of unity of sentiment is required to accord church fellowship? What limits should be assigned to fellowship? How far may denominational fellowship be tolerated and encouraged?

The Scriptures declare that two cannot walk together except they be agreed, and enjoin upon all the members of the Church to "be of one mind." But in consequence of the multiform character of revelation, the imperfection of man's rational and spiritual development, and the diversified influences to which Christians are exposed in their religious training, absolute agreement in the interpretation of Scripture and in the apprehension of its doctrines, has been found practically impossible. As, however, the belief and practice of certain

truths are essential to constitute a Christian, agreement in the belief of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity is indispensable to ecclesiastical fellowship. These doctrines have found expression in creeds, which thus become the test of membership and the bond of fellowship in the Church of Christ.

The Extreme Symbolists have demanded a perfect agreement in both fundamental and non-fundamental aspects of doctrine, embodied them in long and detailed creeds, and insisted upon their unconditional subscription as a term of fellowship. In this manner, the work of religious inquiry has been restrained, freedom of research circumscribed, hypocrisy engendered, schism propagated, and a bigoted exclusiveness maintained.

The so-called Liberals and Radicals relying upon their own reason, disregarding the unbroken testimony of the Church to the system of doctrine taught in the Bible, have reveled in the realm of religious thought in absolute independence, and repudiating all tests, and removing all doctrinal barriers, threw their doors wide open, and claimed and offered unrestricted fellowship.

The result, as might have been anticipated, proved disastrous to orthodoxy and destructive to Christianity. Liberty, transformed into licentiousness, thus laid the eggs from which a reckless individualism hatched the vipers of heresy and infidelity.

The Lutheran Church has had special calls to solve problems of fellowship. At first the Reformers claimed fellowship with the Catholics, and, actuated by forbearance, charity, and hope, were willing to accord it to them. As, however, it became manifest that the Romish Church was unwilling either to correct doctrinal errors or remove corrupting practices, as well as to tolerate the Protestants, the necessity for determining the conditions upon which ecclesiastical fellowship could be safely granted soon arose. For this purpose the Augsburg Confession was prepared, and presented as the basis of ecclesiastical fellowship.

Fellowship may be distinguished as organic and denomina-

tional. Organic fellowship is accorded to those who formally unite with a church, demoninational fellowship is extended by one denomination to another. Organic fellowship requires the belief of the doctrines and the approval of the usages of an ecclesiatical organization; denominational fellowship, the acknowledgment of the orthodoxy and Christian character of the ministry and membership of one denomination by another, and a public recognition of such soundness in the faith and consistency in practice, by according, as exceptional cases, sacramental communion, and pulpit exchanges, as well as ecclesiastical correspondence by exchange of delegates, and co-operation in the general work of spreading the gospel.

When individuals abuse the liberty granted by the terms of organic fellowship, set up their individual opinions against those of the body to which they belong, propagate them, and form a faction, they become covenant breakers, disorganizers and schismatics, who, if not removed from the body by voluntary withdrawal or exclusion, will keep it in a constant state of agitation, alienate one part from another, and, eventually, if successful, overthrow it. From such fellowship must be withdrawn. In the development of Christianity in different ages and lands, denominations are formed, differing in non-essential aspects of doctrine, formative principles, and religious usages, but holding the essential truths of the gospel, and observing its ordinances. To such ecclesiastical fellowship ought to be extended.

Accordingly, the Lutheran Church was prepared to accord organic fellowship to all who received the cardinal articles of faith contained in the Augsburg Confession, and ecclesiastical fellowship to the Calvinists in 1532, and to the Zwinglians in 1536, and in 1555 even concluded a peace with the Catholics. But from the heavenly prophets led by Münzer, Servetus, Campanus, Swenkfeld and other disorganizing fanatics she withheld fellowship.

Mathematical problems are solved according to certain rules. A thorough knowledge of these being obtained, the process of solution proceeds from the given data along the line of logical sequences to the conclusion. The connection

between the premises and the conclusion is predetermined by the necessary principles of the pure mathematics, the course of reasoning must always be the same, and no room is left for weighing evidence, balancing probabilities, and deciding according to their preponderating weight. Church problems, being different in their nature, are decided in a different way. History has treasured up its facts and casts them forward as the data, by a proper use of which ecclesiastical problems are to be solved. To arrive at just conclusions, it is necessary not only to become acquainted with the facts of history, but also to adopt sound principles in interpreting them, and drawing legitimate inferences from them. We have already shown what problems the Lutheran Church has solved, we propose now to exhibit the guides by which she was directed in solving them.

1. *The Lutheran Church, in the solution of Church problems, gave to history its true position.* God governs nature by necessary laws; he governs the Church by moral principles embodied in truth. And while he governs nature in necessity, and the Church in liberty, he, nevertheless, determines the movements of the Church just as much as he does those of nature, in perfect consistency, however, with his perfections and the free agency of man. Accordingly the hand of God is manifest in the development of the Church, and, hence, history contains the footprints of the providential steps of God. History is not, therefore, the mere collection of facts, arbitrarily occurring by chance, disconnected from each other, and tending to no predetermined end. But as nature's facts have a philosophy which underlies and interprets them, so, too, has ecclesiastical history a philosophy, which connects its facts, interprets their true meaning, and draws from them the lessons they are designed to teach.

2. *The Lutheran Church, in the solution of Church problems, acknowledged the Scriptures as the supreme directory.* The Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and, hence, the moral directory of the Church. If any of her ministers or members, either in their individual or associated capacity, err in judgment, and act inconsistently in practice, history, in

recording such mistakes and moral blemishes, does not transform them into a traditionary rival, according to which the Scriptures themselves are to be interpreted, and thereby error and sin canonized. But the Bible, in presenting the moral principles by which the Church is to be governed, and recording the manner in which, both in the Old and New Testament dispensations, she carried them out, becomes and remains the supreme directory of the Church, both in determining ecclesiastical principles and in regulating church practice. The Scriptures, therefore, as revealing the law of God and the testimony of his people, become the umpire, whose decision must be regarded as final in all ecclesiastical affairs.

3. *The Lutheran Church, in the solution of Church problems, accorded to private judgment its inalienable rights.* Man, as rational spirit, is directly responsible to God. The Scriptures are placed in his hands, he is authorized to examine them by the aid of all legitimate helps, and form his own conclusions, unrestricted by any human authority. In his individual capacity, he exercises the right of private judgment, while he remains in a state of isolation, in absolute independency. But necessity is laid upon him, after he becomes a true believer to unite with the Church, and he thereby passes from a state of isolation into one of organization. The doctrines believed and the organic principles adopted by such organization constitute the conditions of membership. These are submitted to the believer for examination in the light of the word of God, and in the exercise of the untrammelled right of private judgment, he is called upon to decide whether, in his judgment, they accord with the infallible standard or not. Satisfied of their correctness, he signifies his approval of them, and unites with the Church. His private judgment has thus been added to the private judgment of each member, constituting the common judgment of the organization, by which each individual voluntarily obligates himself to be governed in faith, teaching, and practice. Provision is thus made for combining individual strength, harmonizing religious movements, and making the Church a concentrated

power for good. Self-preservation, as well as the attainment of the ends of the organization now demand, that the right of private judgment be henceforth restricted to the limits which it has voluntarily imposed upon itself. To assume the obligations required in insincerity is hypocrisy, to repudiate them practically is covenant-breaking, and openly to assail them is schism, involving disloyalty and rebellion. Private judgment does not, however, lose by such subordination to the general judgment of an ecclesiastical body, its inalienable characteristic of individual judgment. The obligations assumed, may be subjected to re-examination, and if the subsequent judgment should differ from the preceding one, the assent given may be withdrawn, the connection formed dissolved, and the burden of obligation removed. There is provision made in most organizations for such modifications and improvements as experience shall call for and the general judgment approve; but the claim of exercising private judgment, while in a state of organization, in absolute independence, contrary to assumed obligations, is absurd, inconsistent with unity, peace and harmony, tending to alienation, dissension and schism, productive of anarchy, and destructive of all organization and government.

4. *The Lutheran Church, in solving ecclesiastical problems, gave due consideration to the principle of development.* God himself is the author of this principle. He was, accordingly, governed by it, both in the gradual completion of revelation, as well as in the form which he gave it. He made known the elementary principles by which the Church was to be governed, but he did not give a full and exhaustive exhibition of them, but left their practical development to the Church, as her wants and experience should dictate. The primitive Church apprehended these formative principles, and, to a certain extent, developed them, and in so far as they were under apostolic guidance, the churches they organized become a model for our imitation. Such development was, however, not complete, and the Church of subsequent ages is authorized to continue and perfect it. The Church may, consequently, originate a creed to preserve "the faith once deliver-

ed to the saints;" she may adopt a system of government; she may prepare forms of worship; she may establish rites and ceremonies; she may originate instrumentalities and agencies; and she may determine the terms of organic and ecclesiastical fellowship. And as her wants prompt and her Head authorized her to do this in the beginning, her practical wisdom learned in the school of experience, will induce her, from time to time, to reject and add, modify and improve, her religious machinery. And adhering to the scriptural principle, she is unrestricted in the form of its development.

5. *The Lutheran Church, in solving ecclesiastical problems, paid due respect to antiquity.* God, having revealed his will in the Scriptures, promised the aid of the Holy Spirit in apprehending its meaning, and constituted Christ "Head over all things to the Church," it seems impossible that a total defection from the truth should ever take place and the existence of the Church destroyed. Accordingly, it can be shown that in all ages there were true confessors of Christ, and Christian Churches in the world. The œcumenical creeds were the depositories of sound doctrine, and, notwithstanding the departures from the true faith which occurred in the early centuries, and especially in the dark ages, many principles were preserved and many customs introduced, which were in their nature scriptural, and in their influence useful. The record of these periods contains the testimony of antiquity.

History, in this manner, furnished data for the solution of Church problems, and the Lutheran Church, in solving them, gave antiquity all the credit to which it was justly entitled. Admitting that the ecclesiastical olive needed pruning, she was willing to cut off useless branches and dangerous excrescences, but realizing that it had, nevertheless, a true life, she refused either to cut it down or to pluck it up by the roots. In other words, the Lutheran reformers were unwilling to pull down with Gothic hand all the ecclesiastical monuments that antiquity had reared, lay another foundation and begin to build anew. They were not revolutionists, but reformers; not radicals, but conservatives; not destructionists, but reconstructionists. Accordingly, they applied the torch to the

wood, hay, and stubble, which Romish antiquity had placed upon the foundation, but they preserved the gold, silver, and precious stones, with which primitive antiquity had adorned the superstructure. They would not by an abuse of religious freedom, sever their connection with the Church of the past, and, imprinting upon their foreheads the brand of schism, form a sect. Neither were they willing, on the other hand, to permit antiquity to bridle liberty and lock the wheels of the Church of the future. But avoiding both the Scylla of the fanatical destructionists, and the Charybdis of the incorrigible Romanists, they steered their ecclesiastical barque by the light house erected by antiquity, and the improved compass discovered by modern Protestantism, midway between them, and anchored it in the haven of safety.

6. *The Lutheran Church, in the solution of ecclesiastical problems, exercised the most wise and judicious discrimination.* Certain truths recorded in Scripture give rise to religious tendencies, which when carried to their fullest extent, without restriction from cognate truths and their legitimate tendencies, result in extremes. The effect must, of course, be injurious and, in due time, under a rigid scrutiny, the mistakes made become manifest. In exposing and endeavoring to correct existing errors, there is always danger of going to the other extreme, and so frequently has this been the case that it has become a proverb to say: "Extremes beget extremes," and to attain what has been termed the "glorious medium, is considered the greatest achievement of human wisdom. The fact just stated was illustrated in the history of the Romish Church, as well as in that of the Reformation.

Almost every subject reconsidered in the sixteenth century, the Romish Church had carried to an extreme, and in exposing and endeavoring to correct her errors, many ran into the opposite extreme, and thus injured Protestantism, and played into the hands of Romanism. In the solution of ecclesiastical problems, history presented the extremes to the reformers, and they were called upon to decide between them. There

is between all classes of extremes a point which occupies the mean, the discovery of which taxes the wisdom of man in the highest degree, and its adoption frequently puts his character to the severest test. While we do not claim infallibility for them, nor maintain that in all cases they discovered the precise dimensions of the ecclesiastical mean, it cannot be successfully denied, that in discriminating between Fanaticism and Romanism, they exercised an extraordinary degree of discretion, and in nearly all cases discovered the "*juste milieu*," and that in adopting it, they exhibited the profoundest insight into the true meaning of the word of God, the most thorough acquaintance with the practical working of different ecclesiastical principles, and displayed at once the noblest heroism, and the most unflinching devotion to truth.

Three and a half centuries have passed since they made their decision. The extremes then existing have continued. Between them ecclesiastical movements have fluctuated, tending sometimes towards the one extreme, and then again towards the other, but the more the medium positions taken by the Reformers are examined, and the more faithfully they are tested, the more rational and scriptural do they appear, the more dear they become to those who have honestly adopted them, and the greater their admiration becomes of the discriminating power with which God endowed the Reformers of the sixteenth century.

In forming a just estimate of the solution given to the ecclesiastical problems by the reformers and founders of the Lutheran Church, it becomes necessary to consider the different influences to which they were exposed, and to give due weight to certain facts that transpired in their history.

The Catholic Powers, being hostile to the Reformation, opposed the reformers. The Protestant Princes, having espoused it, shielded and encouraged them. While they were thus exposed to the interference of the former, they were at the same time influenced by the opinions and wishes of the latter.

"Circumstances," we are told, "make the man." This declaration may be too strong; but that circumstances exert

a moulding influence on the characters and lives of men, is everywhere manifest. The circumstances in which the reformers found themselves were peculiar, changed frequently during the progress of the Reformation, and left their impress on their minds and hearts.

Experience became, also, an important force in their development. As by its light they discovered the doctrinal errors of Rome, so, too, in its school, they learned lessons of wisdom in church organization and development. Their religious training was received in the Romish Church, and while by their subsequent studies, they overcame in a great degree the educational bent thus given them, its impress was never entirely effaced.

Ecclesiastical nomenclature must not be overlooked. In the progress of time, certain terms were used to express theological ideas. On some of these, originated before the rise of the papacy, she foisted a new sense, and others she invented herself. The reformers retained the use of many of these terms, attaching to them, however, an evangelical and scriptural meaning, different from that of the Romanists. When, therefore, the reformers advocated the celebration of the "mass," the retention of "confession," and "absolution," and employed the phrases "baptismal regeneration," and "The true body and blood of Christ," they must not be understood in the Romish, but in the Protestant sense.

By duly contemplating these facts, and the influences to which the reformers, their coadjutors, and successors were exposed, we can the more easily account for the gradual change which took place in their sentiments; the course they pursued at different periods, the differences of opinion that arose among them, the controversies they waged with each other; the various public testimonies of their faith which they subscribed, and the subsequent divisions resulting therefrom.

In this manner the undigested data of Lutheran history are presented to us; and we are called upon to sift, systematize and harmonize them, and then declare the general result.

This we have endeavored to do, and while we admit that individual expressions of sentiment may be cited that seem in conflict with some of the solutions we have given, and periods may be referred to, in which parts of the Lutheran Church abandoned its original catholic principles, and developed an individualized, sectarian, and exclusive Lutheranism; nevertheless, do we insist, that in her formative period, during the life of Luther and Melanchthon, she decided the ecclesiastical problems we have presented, in the manner herein set forth, and thus achieved her victories.

As we interpret the sentiments of Muhlenberg and the Fathers of the Lutheran Church in America, and as we read the Augsburg Confession, the formula of subscription, and the official acts of the General Synod, we maintain that they embody the essential principles of genuine, catholic, historic and scriptural Lutheranism.

Let the General Synod, then, be and remain the conservator of the distinctive characteristics of true Lutheranism—let it develop them harmoniously, symmetrically, and adequately—let it protect them from internal distortion, and guard them against external violence, and under the guidance of a benign Providence, and the continued dispensations of the grace of God, it may, at no very distant day, become the representative of an American Lutheran Church, in doctrine the most sound, in worship the most devotional, in rites the most rational, in experience the most spiritual, in government the most liberal, in character the most holy, in enterprise the most aggressive, in benevolence the most generous, and in all things the most scriptural, the world has ever seen in any age or in any land.

ARTICLE V.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

The acknowledged importance and significance of the late Vatican Council, renders it desirable that some of the more important documents of permanent value, should be published where they can be readily preserved. It is believed that the readers of the REVIEW will be glad to possess them in such a form. A few introductory statements, with accompanying comments, will be printed along, by way of explanation.

For more than three hundred years, the Church of Rome had not ventured on the expedient of calling a General Council, and it was gravely doubted whether another would ever be held under her auspices. She had learned to cherish a salutary dread of such assemblages. But, impelled by what were supposed to be the exigences of the case, Pope Pius IX. determined to try the doubtful experiment, and issued a call for such a Council to assemble in Rome, in the year 1869. The progress of liberal opinions and the waning power of the Pope, made it necessary to do something to stem the current, and, if possible, save the Papacy from utter decay. The pride of human reason must be humbled, the march of modern progress stopped, a check placed upon the freedom of inquiry, and the great dogma of *Papal Infallibility* established, that hereafter the authority of the Church, uttered by the Pope, might not be questioned.

Although various other objects were included, it was manifest, from the very beginning, that the dogma of the Infallibility of the Pope was the main point of interest, and that everything else was only secondary. Indeed, since the meeting of the Council, we scarcely hear of anything else that engaged the attention of that august body. The place of meeting was chosen, and the Council constituted, with a view to the object to be attained. There was the greatest inequality in the representation of different portions of the Church;

those portions being most largely represented that were known to be most favorable to the dogma of *Infallibility.* By the most respectable Catholic authority, the principle has been openly avowed: "That there were not named for it those who were known to be hostile to what has just been declared of faith, was nothing more than natural." Accordingly, Germany, with her many millions of Catholic population, had less than one seventh of the representation of the Papal States with only three-quarters of a million. The representation from the United States, so largely Protestant, was about the same as that from Austria, so largely Catholic. But Austria was tinctured with German liberalism, whilst the American prelates voted, by more than five to one, in favor of *Infallibility.* It had less the character of a representative Council of the whole Catholic Church, than of a packed convention for a special purpose. The earnest appeal of Cardinal Schwartzenburg, of Prague, to Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State at Rome, in favor of such men as the "renowned historian Hefele, in Tübingen, or Döllinger, of Munich, of whose orthodoxy and distinguished erudition every one in Germany is completely convinced," had no effect to secure them an invitation to Rome. They were not needed at the Council.

The whole number summoned, from all quarters of the Catholic world, is stated to have been one thousand, of whom about three-fourths were reported as actually in attendance. The vote, however, as will hereafter be seen, on the great question, fell very far short of that number. Death had thinned their ranks, thirteen having died during the first three months of the sessions of the Council, others becoming wearied had left, and many are reported to have retired with shame and disgust.

The Council met on the 8th day of December, 1869, in the great Cathedral of St. Peter's. Everything had been done to produce the most imposing effect, and to secure harmony and unanimity of action. But notwithstanding the art employed in forming the Council, it was soon apparent that there would be warm and persistent opposition to decreeing the Infallibil-

ity of the Pope. Even in Rome, and in the great St. Peter's, there were some who could not forget their higher obligations to God, the truth, and their own consciences. We cannot dwell upon the various arguments and motives employed to gain over the minority. Some yielded, but others remained steadfast in their opposition. A most respectable minority could not be prevailed upon to yield up their honest convictions. They were overcome and outvoted, but not convinced, and the action of the Council was as far from being unanimous, as its deliberations had been from being harmonious. The vote taken, July 13th, stood 451 *placets*, 62 *placets juxta modum*, and 88 *non placets*. Thus 150 out of 601, who voted refused their assent to the dogma, and it was passed by considerably less than one-half of the number summoned to the Council. Among those who voted against the decree were some of the highest dignitaries, as well as some of the most distinguished divines and learned scholars, including cardinals, patriarchs, and archbishops. *The* 18*th of July*, 1870, is to be forever memorable, as the day on which the dogma of Papal infallibility was formally promulgated as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, to be received and defended by all the faithful. The following is the decree itself, printed in full, both in the original Latin, and also in an English translation, for which we are indebted to the "*Catholic World.*"

FIRST DOGMATIC DECREE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST PUBLISHED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE HOLY ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN.

PASSED JULY 18, 1870.

PIVS EPISCOPVS SERVVS SERVORVM DEI SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.

Pastor aeternus et episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus per-

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, WITH THE APPROBATION OF THE HOLY COUNCIL, FOR A PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE HEREOF.

The eternal Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, in order to render perpetual the saving

enne redderet, sanctam aedificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes, unum essent, sicut ispe Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre; ita in Ecclesia sua Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem saeculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum caeteris Apostolis praeponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusqne unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum, super cuius fortitudinem aeterum exstrueretur templum, et Ecclesiae coelo inferenda sublimitas in huius fidei firmitate consurgeret.* Et quoniam

*S. Leo M. serm. iv. (al. iii.) cap. 2. in diem Natalis sui.

work of his redemption, resolved to build the holy church, in which, as in the house of the living God, all the faithful should be united by the bond of the same faith and charity. For which reason, before he was glorified, he prayed the Father, not for the apostles alone, but also for those who, through their word, would believe in him, that they all might be one, as the Son himself and the Father are one. Wherefore, even as he sent the apostles, whom he had chosen to himself from the world as he had been sent by the Father, so he willed that there should be pastors and teachers in his church even to the consummation of the world. Moreover, to the end that the episcopal body itself might be one and undivided, and that the entire multitude of believers might be preserved in oneness of faith and of communion, through priests cleaving mutually together, he placed the blessed Peter before the other apostles and established in him a perpetual principle of this twofold unity, and a visible foundation on whose strength "the eternal temple might be built,

portae inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam contra eius fundamentum divinitus positum maiori in dies odio undique insurgunt; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse iudicamus, sacro approbante Concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate, ac natura sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo totius Ecclesiae vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam atque constantem universalis Ecclesiae fidem, proponere, atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos errores proscribere et condemnare.

and in whose firm faith the church might rise upward until her summit reach the heavens."* Now, seeing that in order to overthrow, if possible, the church, the powers of hell on every side, and with a hatred which increases day by day, are assailing her foundation which was placed by God, we therefore, for the preservation, the safety, and the increase of the Catholic flock, and with the approbation of the sacred council, have judged it necessary to set forth the doctrine which, according to the ancient and constant faith of the universal church, all the faithful must believe and hold, touching the institution, the perpetuity, and the nature of the sacred apostolic primacy, in which stands the power and strength of the entire church; and to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors so hurtful to the flock of the Lord.

CAPUT I.

DE APOSTOLICI PRIMATUS IN BEATO PETRO INTSITUTIONE.

Docemus itaque et declaramus, iuxta Evangelii testimonia primatum iurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesi-

CHAPTER I.

OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLIC PRIMACY IN THE BLESSED PETER.

We teach, therefore, and declare that, according to the

*St Leo the Great, Sermon iv. (or iii.) chapter 2, on Christmas.

am immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim Simonem, cui iam pridem dixerat: Tu vocaberis Cephas,* postquam ille suam edidit confessionem inquiens: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi, solemnibus hic verbis locutus est Dominus: Beatus es Simon Bar-Iona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus, qui in coelis est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum: et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis.† Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Iesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris iurisdictionem in totum suum ovile, dicens: Pasce agnos meos: Pasce oves meas.‡ Huic tam manifestae sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinae, ut ab

*Joan. 1 : 42.
Matth. 16 : 16—19.
‡Joan. 21 : 15—17.

testimonies of the gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole church of God was promised and given immediately and directly to blessed Peter, the apostle, by Christ our Lord. For it was to Simon alone, to whom he had already said, "Thou shalt be called Cephas,"* that, after he had professed his faith, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," our Lord said, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven; and I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."† And it was to Simon Peter alone that Jesus, after his resurrection, gave the jurisdiction of supreme shepherd

*John 1 : 42.
†Matthew 16 : 16—19.

Ecclesia catholica semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravae eorum sententiae, qui constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes negant, solum Petrum prae caeteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque iurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum: aut qui affirmant eumdem primatum non immediate, directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiae, et per hanc illi, ut ipsius Ecclesiae ministro, delatum fuisse.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiae militantis visibile caput; vel eumdem honoris tantum, non autem verae propriaeque iurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

and ruler over the whole of his fold, saying, "Feed my lambs;" "Feed my sheep."* To this doctrine so clearly set forth in the sacred Scriptures, as the Catholic Church has always understood it, are plainly opposed the perverse opinions of those who, distorting the form of government established in his church by Christ our Lord, deny that Peter alone above the other apostles, whether taken separately one by one or all together, was endowed by Christ with a true and real primacy of jurisdiction; or who assert that this primacy was not given immediately and directly to blessed Peter, but to the church, and through her to him, as to the agent of the church.

If, therefore, any one shall say, that blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed by Christ our Lord, the prince of all the apostles, and the visible head of the whole church militant; or, that he received directly and immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ only the primacy of honor, and not that of true and real jurisdiction; let him be anathema.

---

*John 21 : 15—17.

CAPUT II.

DE PERPETUITATE PRIMATUS BEATI PETRI IN ROMANIS PONTIFICIBUS.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Iesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesiae instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesia, quae fundata super petram ad finem saeculorum usque firma stabit, iugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, imo saeculis omnibus notum est, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesu Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctae Romanae Sedis, ab ipso fundatae, eiusque consecratae sanguine, vivit et praesidet et iudicium exercet.* Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo disposi-

*Cf. Ephesini Concilii Act. iii.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE PERPETUITY OF THE PRIMACY OF PETER IN THE ROMAN PONTIFFS.

What the prince of pastors and the great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, established in the person of the blessed apostle Peter for the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the church, the same through his power must needs last forever in that church, which is founded upon the rock, and will stand firm till the end of time. And indeed it is well known, as it has been in all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the apostles, pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, who received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to this present time and at all times lives and presides and pronounces judgment in the person of his successors, the bishops of the holy Roman see, which was founded by him, and consecrated by his blood.* So that

*Council of Eph. sess. iii. St. Peter Chrys. Ep. ad Eutych.

tio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit.* Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, ut in ea Sede, e qua venerandae communionis iura in omnes diminant, tamquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent.†

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institione seu iure divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem; anathema sit.

*S. Leo. M. Serm. iii.(al. ii.) cap. 3.

†S. Iren. Adv. Haer. l. iii. c. 3. Ep. Conc. Aquilei a. 381, inter epp. S. Ambros, ep xi.

whoever succeeds Peter in this chair, holds, according to Christ's own institution, the primacy of Peter over the whole church. What, therefore, was once established by him who is the truth, still remains, and blessed Peter, retaining the strength of the rock, which has been given to him, has never left the helm of the church originally intrusted to him.*

For this reason it was always necessary for every other church, that is, the faithful of all countries, to have recourse to the Roman Church on account of its superior headship, in order that being joined, as members to their head, with this see, from which the rights of religious communion flow unto all, they might be knitted into the unity of one body.†

If, therefore, any shall say, that it is not by the institution of Christ our Lord himself, or by divine right, that blessed

*S. Leo, Serm. iii. chap. iii.

†St. Irenæus against Heresies, book iii. chap. 3. Epist. of Council of Aquileia, 381, to Gratian, chap. 4. of Pius VI. Brief Super Solidate.

Peter has perpetual successors in the primacy over the whole church; or, that the Roman pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy; let him be anathema.

CAPUT III.

DE VI ET RATIONE PRIMATUS ROMANI PONTIFICIS.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testamoniis et inhaerentes tum Praedecessorum Nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis, perspicuisque decretis, innovamus oecumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum

CHAPTER III.

OF THE POWER AND NATURE OF THE PRIMACY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

Wherefore, resting upon the clear testimonies of holy writ, and following the full and explicit decrees of our predecessors the Roman pontiffs, and of general councils, we renew the definition of the œcumenical council of Florence, according to which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter the prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and is the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church; as is also set fort in the acts of the

etiam in gestis œcumenicorum Conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam disponente Domino super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis iurisdictionis potestatem, quae vere episcopalis est, immediatum esse: erga quam cuiuscumque ritus et dignitatis, pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicae subordinationis, veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae, per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; ita, ut custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam eiusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesia Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Haec est catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare salva fide atque salute nemo potest.

Tantum autem abest, ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariae ac im-

œcumenical councils, and in the sacred canons.

Wherefore, we teach and declare that the Roman Church, under divine providence, possesses a headship of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate, toward which the pastors and faithful of whatever rite and dignity, whether singly or all together, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, not only in things which appertain to faith and morals, but likewise in those things which concern the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the world, so that being united with the Roman pontiff, both in communion and in profession of the same faith, the church of Christ may be one fold under one chief shepherp. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can depart without loss of faith and salvation.

So far, nevertheless, is this power of the supreme pontiff from trenching on that ordi-

mediatae illi episcopali iurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tamquam veri Pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni: Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*

Porro ex suprema illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam ius eidem esse consequitur, in huius sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totius Ecclesiae, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pas-

*Ep. ad Eulog. Alexandrin. l. viii. ep. xxx.

nary power of episcopal jurisdiction by which the bishops, who have been instituted by the Holy Ghost and have succeeded in the place of the apostles, like true shepherds, feed and rule the flocks assigned to them, each one his own; that, on the contrary, this their power is asserted, strengthened, and vindicated by the supreme and universal pastor; as St. Gregory the Great saith: My honor is the honor of the universal church; my honor is the solid strength of my brethren; then am I truly honored when to each one of them the honor due is not denied.*

Moreover, from that supreme authority of the Roman pontiff to govern the universal church, there follows to him the right, in the exercise of this his office, of freely communicating with the pastors and flocks of the whole church, that they may be taught and guided by him in the way of salvation.

Wherefore, we condemn and reprobate the opinions of

*St. Gregory Great ad Eulogius, Epist. 30.

toribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eamdem reddunt saeculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quae ab Apostolica Sede vel eius auctoritate ad regimen Ecclesiae constituunter, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis saecularis placito confirmentur.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatus iure Romanus Pontifex universae Ecclesiae praeest, docemus etiam et declaramus, eum esse iudicem supremum fidelium,* et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse iudicium recurri;† Sedis vero Apostolicae, cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de eius licere iudicare iudicio.‡ Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberant, qui affirmant, licere ab iudiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad oecumenicum Concilium tamquam ad auctorita-

*Pii P. VI. Breve Super Solidate, d. 28. Nov. 1786.

†Concil. Œcum. Lugdun. II.

‡Ep. Nicolai I. ad Michaelem Imperatorem.

those, who say that this communication of the supreme head with the pastors and flocks can be lawfully hindered, or who make it subject to the secular power, maintaining that the things which are decreed by the apostolic see or under its authority for the government of the church, have no force or value unless they are confirmed by the approval of the secular power. And since, by the divine right of apostolic primacy, the Roman pontiff presides over the universal churches, we also teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful,* and that in all causes calling for ecclesiastical trial, recourse may be had to his judgment;† but the dicision of the apostolic see, above which there is no higher authority, cannot be reconsidered by any one, nor is it lawful to any one to sit in judgment on his judgment.‡

Wherefore, they wander away from the right path of

*Pius VI. Brief Super Solidate.

†Second Council of Lyons.

‡Nicholas I. epist. ad Michaelem Imperatorem.

tem Romano Pontifice superiorem appellare.

truth who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman pontiffs to an œcumenical council, as if to an authority superior to the Roman pontiff.

Si quis itaque dixerit Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatum iurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremae potestatis; aut hanc eius potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatum sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; anathema sit.

Therefore, if any one shall say that the Roman pontiff holds only the charge of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the entire church, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the whole world; or, that he possesses only the chief part and not the entire plenitude of this supreme power; or, that this his power is not ordinary and immediate, both as regards all and each of the churches, and all and each of the pastors and faithful; let him be anathema.

CAPUT IV.

DE ROMANI PONTIFICIS INFALLIBILI MAGISTERIO.

Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex tamquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, haec

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF IN TEACHING.

This holy see has ever held—the unbroken custom of the church doth prove—and the œcumenical councils, those especially in which the east joined with the west, in union of faith and of charity, have

Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiae usus comprobat, ipsaque oecumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, maiorum vestigiis inhaerentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: Prima salus est, rectae fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab huius ergo fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes, speramus, ut in una communione, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse mereamur, in qua est integra et vera Christianae religionis solidatis.* Approbante vero

*Ex formula S. Hormisdae Papae, prout ab Hadriano II. Patribus Concilii Oecumenici VIII., Constantinopolitani IV., proposita et ab iisdem subscripta est.

declared that in this apostolic primacy, which the Roman pontiff holds over the universal church, as successor of Peter the prince of the apostles, there is also contained the supreme power of authoritative teaching. Thus the fathers of the fourth council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth this solemn profession:

"The first law of salvation is to keep the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, these words, which he spake, are proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see, the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted, and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the full and true firmness of the Christian religion."*

*Formula of St. Hormisdas Pope, as proposed by Hadrian II. to the

Lugdunenis Concilio secundo, Graeci professi sunt: Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cuius Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut prae caeteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudico definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definivit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Praedecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes

So too, the Greeks, with the approval of the second council of Lyons, protessed, that the holy Roman Church holds over the universal Catholic Church, a supreme and full primacy and headship, which she truthfully and humbly acknowledges that she received, with fulness of power, from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince or head of the apostles, of whom the Roman pontiff is the successor; and as she, beyond the others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so, if any questions arise concerning faith, they should be decided by her judgment. And finally, the council of Florence defined that the Roman pontiff is true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding and ruling and governing the universal church.

In order to fulfil this pas-

---

fathers of the eighth general Council, (Constantinop. IV.,) and subscribed by them.

terrae populos propagaretur, parique cura vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites, nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquae regulae formam sequentes, ea praesertim pericula, quae in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum.* Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis oecumenicis Conciliis aut explorata Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae sententia, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quae divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quae sacris Scripturis et apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea, Deo adiutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revela-

*Cf. S. Bern. Epist. 190.

toral charge, our predecessors have ever labored unweariedly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long established custom of the churches, and the form of ancient rule, referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail.* And the Roman pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as divine providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be held, which, by the aid of God, they knew to be con-

*St. Bernard ep. 190.

tionom seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factam: Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei numquam deficientis charisma Petro eiusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, coelestis doctrinae pabulo nutriretur,

formable to the holy Scriptures, and the apostolic traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter, that they may make known a new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard, and faithfully set forth the revelation delivered by the apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this their apostolic teaching, all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour made to the prince of the apostles: I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.

Therefore, this gift of truth, and of faith which fails not, was divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors in this chair, that they should exercise their high office for the salvation of all, that through them the universal flock of Christ should be turned away from the poisonous food of

ut sublata schismatis occasione Ecclesia tota una conservaretur atque suo fundamento innixa firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero cum hac ipsa aetate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius actoritati obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, praerogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio coniungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianae exordio perceptae fideliter inhaerendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam religionis Catholicae exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam

error, and should be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that, the occasion of schism being removed, the entire church should be preserved one, and, planted on her foundation, should stand firm against the gates of hell.

Nevertheless, since in this present age, when the saving efficacy of the apostolic office is exceedingly needed, there are not a few who carp at its authority; we judge it altogether necessary to solemnly declare the prerogative, which the only begotten Son of God has deigned to unite to the supreme pastoral office.

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition handdown from the commencement of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed: that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme

definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic Nostrae definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, praesumpserit; anathema sit.

Datum Romae, in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octigentesimo septuagesimo, die decima octava Iulii.

Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quinto

Ita est

IOSEPHUS

Episcopus S. Hippolyti Secretarius Councilii Vaticani.

apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemed willed his church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith or morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the church thereto.

And if any one shall presume, which God forbid, to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema.

Given in Rome, in the Public Session, solemnly celebrated in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July; in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

Ita est.

JOSEPH, BISHOP OF ST. POLTEN,

Secretary of the Council of the Vatican.

The dogma of Infallibility was thus defined and adopted. Henceforth the Church and the world need not doubt where this Infallibility is to be found. It centres in the successors of St. Peter, who possess "that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed." To settle this was the grand achievement of the last General Council at Rome.

But whilst the Council secured nominally the great object desired, and even many of those who, at the time, opposed the dogma, have like good Catholics yielded in humble submission, a strong spirit of opposition has been aroused, which has refused all attempts at conciliation, and which continues to gain strength and to extend its influence. Foremost and most prominent of all the opponents to the dogma of Papal Infallibility, is the learned and distinguised Dr. Döllinger, for so many years Professor of Church History and Canon Law in the University of Munich. The part he has taken, and the place he now holds in the eyes of the Christian world, will justify a brief notice of the man, and also the publication of his celebrated letter to the Archbishop of Munich.

Dr. Joseph John Ignatius Döllinger was born, at Bamberg, on the 28th of February, 1799, and is consequently in his seventy-third year. He received a liberal education, and, in his twenty-third year, was ordained a priest. From the first, he showed that order of talents and love of study which have won for him his exalted position. In 1826, when the University was removed from Landshut to Munich, he became identified with the city and university, and continues to hold his position, and has now become the honored head of one of the most renowned seats of learning in the world. He has occupied most responsible positions, both in State and Church, and is the author of numerous learned works, especially in the department of Church History. For nearly fifty years he has been helping to mould the mind of Catholic Germany, and nearly all her bishops are said to have been trained by him. As an author and a theologian he stands acknowledged as the very first in the Catholic Church. His long list of ti-

tles has very recently been swelled by an almost unanimous election as Rector of the University, which his talents and learning have graced for so many years.

It has been mentioned that he was not invited to the Council, and it was soon understood that he did not endorse its action. When Scherr, Archbishop of Munich, demanded submission to the decree of the Council, and, in two letters, insisted on Döllinger's explaining or defining his position, he addressed to him a lengthy and elaborate reply, which has elicited the admiration of all the friends of religious truth and freedom, and which must hereafter rank as one of the noblest and sternest protests against Papal usurpation and ecclesiastical tyranny.

DR. DÖLLINGER'S REPLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF MUNICH.

Your Excellency has asked me in two letters to explain my position with respect to the Romish Resolutions of July 18th, 1870, which have been published by you.

It has transpired in the circle of your Cathedral Chapter, that it is your intention to proceed against me with such penal measures, as are used only against such priests as have been guilty of gross moral crimes, and even but seldom against these. This is to occur if I do not, within a certain period, submit myself to the two new articles of faith, as to the universal (*Allgewalt*) power and infallibility of the Pope.

I learn at the same time that a council-meeting of German Bishops is to take place shortly at Fulda.

In the year 1848, when a meeting of all the German Bishops was held at Würzburg, the honor of an invitation was extended to myself, and I took part in the proceedings. Your excellency might perhaps arrange that I might be allowed in the meeting which is about to take place, not this time to take part in the proceedings, but to have an audience for a few hours.

For I am prepared to prove before this meeting the following theses, which are of decisive importance for the present

situation of the German Church, as well as for my personal position.

Firstly, the new articles of faith are based upon the texts in the Holy Scriptures, St. Matt. 16 : 18, and St. John 21 : 17, and, as far as Infallibility is concerned, upon the text St. Luke 22 : 32, with which the same, Biblically considered, must stand or fall. But we are bound by a solemn oath, which I myself have twice sworn, to 'accept and to explain the Holy Scriptures, not otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' The Fathers of the Church have all, without exception, explained the texts in question as bearing a totally different meaning to the new decrees, and especially in the text St. Luke 22 : 32 have found anything but an infallibility given to the Pope. Therefore, were I to accept with the decrees this explanation, without which every Biblical basis to the same is wanting, I should commit a perjury. And, as I have said, I am prepared to prove this to the Bishops in council.

Secondly, in several Episcopal pastorals and notices which have lately appeared, the assertion has been made, or the historical proof sought, that the new doctrine now proceeding from Rome as to the universal power of the Pope over every single Christian, and as to the Papal Infallibility in decisions in the Church on matters of faith from the beginning, through all time and forever, has been generally, or at least nearly generally, believed and taught. I am ready to prove that this assertion is based upon an entire misconception of the traditions of the Church for the first thousand years, and upon an entire distortion of her history. It is in direct contradiction to the plainest facts and testimonies.

Thirdly, I am ready to prove that the Bishops of the Latin countries, Spain, Italy, South America, France, who formed the immense majority at Rome, were, with their clergy, already led astray by the class-books from which they took their ideas during their Seminary education; since the proofs given in these books are for the most part false, invented or distorted. I shall prove this, firstly, with the two principal and favorite works of modern theological schools and semi-

naries, *The Moral Philosophy of St. Alphonsus Liguori* (and especially as regards the treatise contained therein concerning the Pope), and with *The Theology of the Jesuit Peroni;* further, with the writings of the Archbishop Cardoni, and of Bishop Ghilardi, which were distributed in Rome during the Council; and finally, with *The Theology of the Viennese Theologian Schwetz.*

Fourthly, I appeal to the fact, which I am ready to prove in public, that two General Councils and several Popes have already decided in the fifteenth century by solemn decrees, issued by the Councils, repeatedly confirmed by the Popes, the question as to the extent of the Pope's power, and as to his infallibility, and that the decrees of the 18th of July, 1870, are in the most glaring contradiction to these resolutions, and therefore cannot possibly be considered as binding.

Fifthly, I believe that I shall be able to prove that the new decrees are simply incompatible with the Constitutions of the States of Europe, and especially with that of Bavaria; and that I find it impossible for me, who am bound by oath to this Constitution, which I have lately sworn on my admission to the Chamber of Councillors of State, to accept the new decrees, and as their necessary consequence, the Bulls 'Unam Sanctam' and 'Cum ex Apostolatus officio,' the Syllabus of Pius IX., with so many other Papal declarations and laws, which are now to be accepted as infallible decisions, and are in irreconcilable antagonism to the laws of the country. I appeal on this subject to the opinion given by the Legal Faculty in Munich, and am ready to abide by the arbitration of any German legal Faculty which your Excellency may be pleased to name.

I only ask two conditions for the Conference which I have proprosed, or rather prayed for; the first that my assertions, together with any counter-assertions, shall be recorded, with a view to their subsequent publication; the second, that a man of scientific culture, to be chosen by me, shall be allowed to be present at the Conference.

Should this be unattainable before the German Bishops in Fulda, I venture most respectfully to proffer another request,

that it may please your Excellency to form, out of the members of your Cathedral Chapter, a committee, before which I may plead my cause in the way above-mentioned. Several of these venerable gentlemen are Doctors, and were formerly Professors of Theology, and at the same time my former scholars. I may hope that it would be more agreeable to them to treat with me in quiet argument, to confute me, if possible, with reasons and facts, than to draw up, upon the seat of judgment, criminal sentences against me, and to submit the same to your Excellency, to be fulminated, as the saying is. If your Excellency will consent to preside at this Conference, and will condescend to correct any errors into which I may have fallen in the citation and explanation of testimonies and facts, I shall count it as a great honor, and the cause of truth can only profit thereby. And when you place before me the prospect of the exercise of your pastoral power, I may still hope that you will prefer to employ, in the first place, towards me, the finest, most noble, most benevolent, and most Christ-like attribute of this power—namely, the teacher's office. Should I be convinced by testimonies and facts, I engage myself to revoke publicly all that I have written in this matter, and to confute myself. In any case the results must be advantageous to the Church, and the peace of spirits. For it is not myself alone who am concerned; thousands of the clergy, hundreds of thousands of the laity think as I do, and find it impossible to accept the new articles of faith.

Up to this day not a single one, even of those who have signed a declaration of submission, has said to me that he is really convinced of the truth of these theses. All my friends and acquaintances confirm me in this experience; 'not a single person believes in it,' is what I hear day by day from all lips. A Conference such as I have proposed, and the publication of the proceedings, will in any case afford that deeper insight which so many long for.

Perhaps your Excellency will refer me to the Pastoral issued recently by yourself, as a source from which I can draw sufficient instruction and correction of my opinions; but I

must confess that it has had exactly the opposite effect upon me, and I am ready to prove that there is there a long list of misunderstood, distorted, mutilated, or invented testimonies, which, taken together with the suppression of the most important facts and counter-proofs, form a most unreal picture of the true tradition. It is certain that the person to whom your Excellency intrusted this task did not invent these falsifications, but has borrowed them in good faith from others (Cardoni, for instance), but were it his desire to defend his work at the proposed Conference, he would find me ready to prove my assertion in a few hours, or should I not succeed in doing so, to make public apology to him. I would only ask for one condition in consideration of the importance of the matter—viz: that the Government be requested to allow a statesman, learned in historical and ecclesiastical matters, to attend the Conference. As the case is one of the highest importance for all Governments, it may be assumed that this request would not be refused.

There is no want of precedents in the past history of the Church, which show that my proposal is in accordance with the principles as well as with the practice of the Church. In the year 411, a Conference of two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist Bishops held three sessions under the presidency of the Imperial officer of State, Marcellinus, and the disputed doctrine was discussed, upon which the latter decided in favor of the Catholic Bishops. In the year 1433 Bohemian Calixtines appeared at the Council of Basle, and a decree which had been issued eighteen years before by the Synod of Constance, as to the Communion in one kind, was now submitted to new discussion and examination, the result being that compromise (also acknowledged by the Papal chair) which was a most important and fundamental concession to the Bohemians, and one differing widely from the older decree. A still greater similarity with the transaction proposed by myself is to be found in the Conference, so celebrated in French history, between the Bishop Du Perron of Evreux, and the Protestant statesman and *savant*, Du Plessis-Mornay, which took place in the

year 1600, at Fontainebleau, under the auspices of King Henry the IVth. Here it was a question as to the proof that Mornay had falsified or incorrectly quoted a considerable number of authorities in his book upon the Eucharist. Henry himself presided, and the most eminent men of both Churches were present as witnesses. The Conference was interrupted after a few days, and after a number of Mornay's quotations had been examined, by the illness of the latter, but caused, nevertheless, a remarkably favorable effect for the Catholic cause, in the excited minds of that period.

Most venerable Archbishop, I leave entirely to your own judgment which form you will give to a Conference so much desired by myself, and certainly so welcome to multitudes of German Catholics, and what persons you will invite to attend, or oppose to me; in your Diocese there is certainly no want of professional theologians who will be glad to accept your invitation. The practice of the Church proves that a question of faith is just as much an affair of the laity as of the clergy, and that the former may take part in the scientific examination and establishment of the tradition, a fact which both Popes and theologians have acknowledged. And in this case, which is a matter for historical proof, I am gladly ready to submit to the verdict of the most eminent historians of the German nation and of the Catholic faith. Such men as Ficker, Reumont, Höfler, Arneth, Kampschulte, Cornelius, Lorenz, Wegele, Aschbach, may judge whether my proofs be critically and historically right or not.

Your Excellency was pleased formerly to honor my book on the First Ages of the Church Apostolical with your approval, and it was generally considered among German Catholics to be a true picture of the time of foundation: even the Jesuitic-Ultramontane party let it pass without censure. But if the new decrees contain the truth, then I have laid myself open to the reproach of having entirely misrepresented the history of the Apostles. The entire section of my book which concerns the constitution of the earlier Church, my description of the relation in which Paul and the other Apostles stood to Peter—all is fundamentally wrong, and I

ought to condemn my own book, and confess that I have neither understood Luke's Acts of the Apostles nor their own Epistles.

The new doctrine of the Vatican invests the Pope with entire plenary power (*totam plenitudinem potestatis*) over the whole Church, as well as over every single layman, priest, or Bishop; a power which is to represent at the same time the truly Episcopal, and again the specifically Papal power—which is to include in itself everything concerning faith, morals, duty, discipline, which shall reach every one from the monarch to the day laborer, and can punish, command, and forbid him. The wording is so carefully arranged, that no other position and authority remains for the Bishop than that of Papal commissaries or delegates. And in this manner, as every one acquainted with Church history and with the Fathers will confess, the Episcopacy of the early Church is essentially dissolved, and an Apostolic institution to which, according to the judgment of the Fathers, the highest importance and authority in the Church is due, is subtilized to a bodiless shadow.

For no one will think it possible that there should exist two Bishops in the same Diocese, one of whom is at the same time Pope, the other being simply a Bishop—and a Papal vicar or Diocesan commissary is not a Bishop, is no successor of the Apostles; he may, through the powers conceded to him from Rome, be very mighty, so long as his principal allows him to rule, just in the same way as a Jesuit or mendicant friar to whom the Pope has granted abundance of privileges also possesses great power; and I well know that such an extension of their powers has been held out in prospect to the Bishops in Rome; that they have been told, 'The more irresistible the Pope, the stronger shall ye be, for the rays of the abundance of his power shall fall also on you.' The Bishops of the minority have penetrated the delusion of these promises; they understood clearly, as the 'Analytical Synopsis' shows, that as soon as the universal Episcopacy of the Pope should be established, they might indeed continue to be dignitaries of the Church, but no longer true Bishops. You

yourself, venerable Sir, took part in the deputation which made such urgent counter-representations to the Pope, on the 15th of July, 1870—representations which Bishop von Ketteler (Mayence) sought to emphasize by prostration! We know that these representations were fruitless. The sole consolation given to the Bishops mourning the loss of their ecclesiastical dignity was confined to the declaration in the decree that the Episcopal power is an 'ordinary' one (*i. e.*, a 'potestas ordinaria subdelegata,' as the Romish canonists are accustomed to express it), and that the Pope considers it to be his duty to support them, this being vouched by a mutilated saying of Gregory the Great, by a passage which, if it with others had been quoted in its entirety, would indeed have proved to the world that this Pope of the seventh century put away from himself with the deepest horror such a universal Episcopacy as has been established, considering it a blasphemous usurpation.

Nor has there been any lack of prayers, representations, and warnings, before and during the Council. You, yourself, venerable Sir, took part in the same by your signature. The Bishops of the minority have declared in an address to the Pope, on the 12th of January, signed by yourself, that "the declarations and acts of the Fathers of the Church, the *true* documents of history, the Catholic educational system itself, presented the most serious difficulties in opposition to the proclamation of the doctrine of Infallibility"—they were, as they themselves said, afraid even to discuss these difficulties, and prayed the Pope to relieve them from the necessity of such a discussion—*i. e.*, to relinquish his infallibility. But when the Pope insisted that the Council should occupy itself therewith, the German Bishops demanded, on the 11th of March, exhaustive conferences on the question of Infallibitity, to be conducted by deputations chosen from both sides. These were not granted; and they had to content themselves with speeches in the Aula, where any regular discussion was an impossibility.

As to the indispensability and urgent need of such confer-

ences, I would only quote here *one* instance. A considerable number of Italian Bishops demanded in a since printed address that Papal Infallibility should be raised to a dogma of faith, because two men, both Italians and both the pride of their nation, Thomas Aquinas and Alphonsus Liguori, these shining lights of the Church, had thus taught. Now, it was well known and proved by me, as well as by Gratry, that Thomas had been deceived by a long series of invented testimonies, as indeed he bases his teaching in this instance almost exclusively upon such falsifications, and never upon genuine passages of the Fathers and Councils. And as to Liguori, a single glance at his writings is sufficient to convince any practiced theologian that his dealings with falsified passages are still worse than those of Thomas. My exposure of the fraud to which the latter had succumbed had created great sensation in Rome. The author of a pamphlet published there, and directed against myself, says that a great cry had been raised on the subject round about him. It ought therefore to have been indispensably necessary to examine closely into the matter. It is true that such an examination, carefully and thoroughly begun, would have led very far; it would have resulted in the proof that the theory of Papal Infallibility had been introduced into the Church solely by a series of calculated inventions and falsifications, and had then been spread and maintained by force, by the suppression of older teaching, and by the many means and artifices which are at the disposal of the ruling power.

All exertions, representations, and petitions, then, were fruitless: nothing was conceded, and yet the example of the so-often quoted Council of Florence was before their eyes, when the assertion of the Greeks, that falsified passages of the Fathers were laid before them, led to examinations and discussions lasting many months, and carried on with the greatest care. It is assuredly known to your Excellency that the most careful and ripe consideration of tradition has invariably been required of any true Œcumenical Council about to issue dogmatic resolutions. How great the contrast in this respect between Trent and that which occurred in Rome in

1870! Certainly the treatise of Archbishop Cardoni, which was accepted at once by the Preparatory Committee, and which was to be considered by the assembled Bishops as a proof, could not have supported examination for one single hour.

In the whole history of the Church I only know of *one* General Council in which, as in this last, those in power prevented any thorough discussion of the tradition, and this was the Second of Ephesus in the year 449; there, in the so-called Synod of Thieves (Räubersynode), this was done by force and by tumultuous tyranny. In the Vatican Council the order of proceeding imposed on the assembly, the Papal Committee, and the will of the majority, suffered no regular and critical examination to be made. Such an examination would assuredly have brought to the light many awkward and unpleasant matters, but it would have preserved the Church from a state of confusion which must appear pitiable to yourself. If you notwithstanding assert that the Vatican assembly was entirely free, you take the word 'free' in a sense which theological circles do not generally attach to it. A Council is only then theologically free when free examination and discussion of all objections and difficulties has taken place, when exceptions have been admitted, and examined in accordance with the rules for ascertaining the tradition. That not even the most modest beginning was made in this direction, that indeed the immense majority of the Bishops from Latin countries wanted either the will or the power to distinguish truth from falsehood, right from wrong, is proved by the pamphlets which appeared in Italy and were distributed in Rome—for instance, those of the Dominican Bishop of Mondori, Ghilardi; and further by the fact that hundreds of these Bishops could without blushing rest their case upon the unassailable authority of Alphonsus Liguori.

It is well known that the Jesuits, when they had conceived the plan of establishing Papal absolutism in Church and State, in education and administration, as a dogma, invented the so-called "Sacrificio dell' intelletto," and assured their adherents and disciples—yes, even persuaded many, and among

them many Bishops—that the most beautiful act of adoration of the Almighty and the most noble Christian heroism consist in this—that man, renouncing his own spiritual light of self-gained understanding and discernment, should throw himself with blind faith into the arms of our unerring Papal magistracy, as the sole sure source of religious knowledge. And this religious order has indeed had great success in raising in the eyes of numbers intellectual indolence to the dignity of a religions sacrifice full of merit, and has even moved men, whose culture would have enabled them to enter upon an historical examination, to abandon the same. But as far as we may judge from their Pastorals, the German Bishops have not yet descended to this point of delusion. They still concede to human knowledge, to human search and examination, a right to exist and a sphere of activity. They themselves appeal to history, as does the Pastoral which has appeared under your name.

In a Pastoral Letter which has just been sent to me, Bishop Lothar von Kübel in Freiburg says on p. 9—"Does the Pope receive new revelations? Can he *create new articles of faith?* Certainly not. He can only declare that a doctrine is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and in tradition; therefore is revealed by God, and must be believed of all." I do not doubt that your Excellency, and all other German Bishops, are fully agreed with these words. But the question is, then, in the present confused state of the Church simply an historical one, which is to be treated and decided upon according to the means in our power, and to the rules which are applicable to every historic search, to every discovery of past facts, that is to say, of such as belong to history. There are in this case no special or secret sources of which the Popes alone have the right or power to avail themselves. Both Pope and Bishops must in this case necessarily, if I may use the expression, place themselves under the common law—*i. e.*, if their resolutions are to endure, they must adopt that course, must initiate that examination of witnesses with the requisite sifting and critical proof of evidence, which alone in the judgment of all men of capacity in historical matters is able

to give us truth and certainty. There were, therefore, and remain yet, two questions to be answered, in accordance with this course. Firstly, is it the truth that the three sayings of Christ respecting Peter were understood from the beginning through all centuries in the whole Church in the sense which is now given to them—namely, that of an infallibility and boundlessly universal power granted thereby to the Popes? Secondly, is it true that the ecclesiastical tradition of all time in the writings of the Fathers, and the facts of history prove the general acknowledgment of this double right of the Pope?

If these questions must be answered in the negative, it is not permissible to appeal, as Bishop von Kübel and others do, to the assistance of the Holy Ghost, as promised to the Pope, and to the obedience of faith due on this account to him: for what we are to examine into historically is just whether this assistance has been promised to him. And where has this been done? Not in the Council, for there, as Cardoni's principal treatise proves, even falsifications were not shunned, and an entirely unreal picture of tradition has been given, with a suppression of the most striking facts and counter-testimonies. And it is precisely this which I am ready to prove.

And here I beg your Excellency to consider that the doctrine which we are now to adopt forms by its own nature, and by the declaration of the Pope himself, by the confession of all infallibilists, *a fundamental article of faith*—that it is a question of the *regula fidei*, of the rule which must decide what is to be believed and what is not. In future every Catholic Christian could only answer the query why he believes this or that, as follows: "I believe, or deny it, because the infallible Pope has commanded me to believe, or to deny it." Nor can this first principle of faith, as the Holy Scriptures necessarily should most clearly show, ever have been doubtful in the Church—it must at every date and among every people have governed the whole Church—like a brightly shining star it must have been placed in the front of all instruction; and we all wait for an explanation, how it is to be cleared up that only after 1830 years the Church has started the idea of

making an article of faith of a doctrine which the Pope calls, in a letter addressed to your Excellency on the 28th of October, "ipsum fundamentale principium Catholicæ fidei ac doctrinæ." How can it have been possible that the Popes should have, during centuries past, exempted whole countries, whole schools of theology, from belief in this 'fundamental article of faith'? And, may I add? how is it that your Excellency yourself strove so long and so persistently against the enunciation of this dogma? Becauso it was not opportune, you say. But can it ever have been 'inopportune' to give to believers the key of the whole temple of faith, to announce to them the fundamental article on which all the rest depends? We stand all of us giddy before a chasm which opened before us on the 18th on July last.

He who wishes to measure the immense range of these resolutions may be urgently recommended to compare thoroughly the third chapter of the decrees in Council with the fourth, and to realize for himself what a system of universal government and spiritual dictation stands here before us. It is the plenary power over the whole Church as over each separate member, such as the Popes have claimed for themselves since Gregory VII., such as is pronounced in the numerous Bulls since the Bull 'Unam sanctam,' which is from henceforth to be believed and acknowledged in his life by every Catholic. This power is boundless, incalculable: it can, as Innocent III. said, strike at sin everywhere; can punish every man, allows of no appeal, is sovereign and arbitrary, for, according to Bonifacius VIII., the Pope "carries all rights in the shrine of his bosom." As he has now become infallible, he can in one moment, with the one little word 'orbi' (that is, that he addresses himself to the whole Church,) make every thesis, every doctrine, every demand, an unerring and irrefragable article of faith. Against him there can be maintained no right, no personal or corporate freedom—or, as the canonists say, the tribunal of God and that of the Pope are one and the same. This system bears its Romish origin on its forehead, and will never be able to penetrate in Germanic countries. *As a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, as a citi-*

zen, I cannot accept this doctrine. Not as a Christian, for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel, and with the plain words of Christ and of the Apostles; it purposes just that establishment of the kingdom of this world which Christ rejected; it claims that rule over all communions which Peter forbids to all and to himself. Not as theologian—for the whole true tradition of the Church is in irreconcilable opposition to it. Not as historian can I accept it, for as such I know that the persistent endeavor to realize this theory of a kingdom of the world has cost Europe rivers of blood, has confounded and degraded whole countries, has shaken the beautiful organic architecture of the elder Church, and has begotten, fed, and sustained the worst abuses in the Church.

Finally, as a citizen, I must put it away from me, because by its claims on the submission of States and monarchs, and of the whole political order under the Papal power, and by the exceptional position which it claims for the clergy, it lays the foundation of endless, ruinous dispute between State and Church, between clergy and laity. For I cannot conceal from myself that this doctrine, the results of which were the ruin of the old German Kingdom, would, if governing the Catholic part of the German nation, at once lay the seed of incurable decay in the new kingdom which has just been built up.*

Accept, &c., (Signed)

I. von Döllinger.

Munich, March 28, 1871.

This reply, dated Munich, March 28th, 1871, brought speedily down upon its author the severest penalty of the Church. The *major excommunicatio* was pronounced against

*I have just read in the official organ of the Roman Curia and of the Jesuits—in the *Civilta* of the 18th of March, 1870, "The Pope is chief judge of all civil law. In him are combined the spiritual and worldly powers, joining in him as in a point, for he is the Vicegerent of Christ, who is not only the Eternal Priest, but also King of kings and Lord of lords:" and immediately following this, "The Pope is by his high dignity, at the head of both powers."

him, cutting him off from the communion of the Church, and denying him the use of the sacraments, whilst living, and the rites of Christian burial, when dead. This excommunication, published on Easter Sunday, April 9th, is now in force; but it has not hindered his King from conveying to him the assurance of his sympathy and regard, nor restrained fifty-four out of sixty of his colleagues from voting for him as Rector of the University. He has been literally burdened with demonstrations attesting the estimation in which his character and actions are held. What the result will be remains to be seen. But Dr. Döllinger has dared to tell his Archbishop, in the face of the whole world, concerning the dogma of Papal Infallibility, "*not a single person believes in it*"—"*thousands of the clergy, hundreds of thousands of the laity think as I do, and find it impossible to accept the new articles of faith.*"

Dr. Döllinger may not prove himself to be a second Luther. Indeed we do not expect that he will. No great secession from the Church of Rome may take place as the result of this movement. The wound of the Beast may be healed, and the world may continue to wonder at the great power the Church of Rome wields. Still that has been done which can never be undone. The decree of Infallibility cannot be reconsidered or set aside. The dogma has gone forth and cannot now be recalled. On the other hand, this dogma does not, and cannot, receive the assent of the whole Church, or of the more intelligent and thinking portion of the Church. Dr. Döllinger is a representative man, and thousands, and tens of thounsands, will join in support of his views. They cannot ignore what is too plain not to be seen. The pretence of Infallibility is too silly to be received. The Church thus presents the aspect of a kingdom divided against itself. This is at least another of the many breaks in the boasted unity of the Roman Catholic Church, and another of the many exhibitions of weakness, under the influence of which that Church must, sooner or later, crumble and fall in pieces. Every such shaking brings nearer the consummation—"*Babylon is fallen, is fallen.*"

ARTICLE VI.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN.

THEOLOGICAL AND BIBLICAL.—Among works of this kind, for the last quarter, we note *Parables of the New Testament Unfolded*, by Rt. Rev. Wm. Bacon Stevens, D. D., Bishop of Pennsylvania; *The Study of the Bible*, a series of expository chapters, by Henry Dunn; *The Life that Now Is*, a volume of sixteen sermons, of the Unitarian teaching, by Rev. Robert Collyer; Whedon's *Commentary on New Testament*, containing *Acts* and *Romans;* a *Life of Christ*, by Henry Ward Beecher; *The Incarnation and Principles of Evidence*, an essay by R. H. Hutton, of the London Spectator; *A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek*, by Fred. Gardiner, described in our Book Notices; a similar *Harmony*, in English, according to the authorized version by the same author; A Portable *Commentary, Critical and Explanatory*, on the Old and New Testaments, by Rev. R. Jamieson, D. D., Rev. A. R. Faussett, and Rev. David Brown, D. D.; *A Key to the Pentateuch*, explanatory of the Text and the Grammatical Forms, by Solomon Deutsch, A. M., Ph. D.; *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I., by Dr. Charles Hodge, D. D., to be completed in three volumes.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—This department of literature is active. We mark among the principal issues, Dr. Wm. A. Hammond's *Treatise on the Diseases of the Nervous Systen; Light and Electricity*, by Prof. Tyndall; also Tyndall's *Hours of Exercise in the Alps; Recent Discussions in Science, Philosophy, and Morals*, a volume of recent papers by Herbert Spencer; *Light Science for Leisure Hours*, by Richard A. Proctor; *Metaphysics*, by Prof. Mansel, presenting in concise form various topics of metaphysical inquiry, with brief sketches of different schools of German philosophy; *The Student's Elements of Geology*, by Sir Charles Lyell, noticed elsewhere in this number; *A Treatise on Ventilation*, by Lewis W. Leeds, showing the want of better methods of ventilation in our buildings; *Table of Reactions* for Qualitative Chemical Analysis, by Henry B. Nason; *War and the Weather*, or the Artificial Production of Rain, by Edward Powers.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—The second volume of *The Life of John Milton*, by David Masson, has been published, bringing the narrative down to the meeting of the Westminster Assembly in 1643; *The Life of Rev. Geo. Junkin, D. D., LL. D.*, well know for his activity in the controversy that some years ago divided the Presbyterian Church into two bodies; the

fourth volume of McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia; Temples, Tombs, and Monuments* of Ancient Greece and Rome, with engravings, for popular reading, by W. H. Davenport Adams; a popular *Life of Sir Walter Scott*, by Dr. R. Shelton Mackenzie; *The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson*, compiled from Family Letters and Reminiscences, by Sarah N. Randolph; The *Life of John Adams*, by John Quincy Adams, in two vols.; *Alfred the Great*, by Thomas Hughes, M. P.

General Literature.—Worthy of note are the *Songs of the Sierras*, by Joaquin Miller, the new and suddenly famous California poet; *Four Years at Yale*, by a Graduate of '69, for some account of which see Book Notices of this number; *Pictures of Travel*, in Sweden, among the Hartz Mountains, and in Switzerland, with a visit at Charles Dicken's House, by Hans Christian Anderson; The *Sword and Garment*, treating of the relations and duties of the pulpit, by the author of *Credo; Reindeer, Dogs, and Snow-Shoes*, a Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations, by Richard J. Bush, noticed in this number.

BRITISH.

Of British publications we can mention only a few: *The Five Great Monarchies* of the Ancient Eastern World, or the Geography and Antiquity of Chaldæa, Assyria, Babylon, Media, and Persia, complete in three volumes, by George Rawlinson, M. A.; *Modes* of *Origin* of *Lowest Organisms*, including a discussion of the Experiments of M. Pasteur, and a Reply to some statements of Profs. Huxley and Tyndall, by H. Charlton Bastian, D. D.; *Life Theories*, their influence upon Religious Thought, by Lionel S. Beale, M. D.

GERMAN.

Biblical.—The second part of Prof. Dr. J. Bachman's commentary on the *Book* of *Judges* has appeared. The commentary is thorough, pays special attention to the history of the interpretation of the Book, and also to the use of the Book in the services of the sanctuary. This second part consists of three hundred pages, which are devoted exclusively to the fourth and fifth chapters of the Book.

Of Hupfeld's scholarly commentary on the *Psalms*, four vols., a second edition has appeared under the editorship of his successors at Halle, Prof. Dr. E. Riehm. The author, who was the successor of Gesenius at the University of Halle, was eminent as an orientalist. In his commentary on the Psalms we have the ripest results of his researches. Even those who are more orthodox than the author was, and consequently dissent from many of his views, are forced to acknowledge the merits of his commentary. To the critical student of the Psalms it is very valuable.

In a volume of two hundred pages Prof. Dr. H. Graetz furnishes a commentary on *Ecclesiastes*. Besides an Appendix and a lengthy Introduction, the volume contains the original text, a translation, and a commentary.

In the Introduction the author comes to the surprising conclusion that the Book was written in the time of Herod, King of Judea!

The first part of a posthumous commentary on *Job*, by Prof. E. W. Hengstenberg, is published by Schlawitz, in Berlin. H. does not agree with those who regard the Book of Job as the oldest in the canon. (Ebrard and others think it was written before Moses). He, as well as Hofmann and others, regard it as a product of the age of Solomon.

Under the title *The Evangelist* of *the Old Testament*, J. Steinecke furnishes a commentary on the second part of Isaiah, chap. 40—66. S. thinks the author of this part of Isaiah is unknown, but makes him cotemporary with Cyrus. Contrary to the expectation excited by the title, S. rejects the Messianic interpretation of these chapters.

A commentary on the prophets *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, by W. Pressel, has appeared. Besides a translation of the original, and exegetical notes, the author gives the leading theological ideas of the text, and homiletical hints.

Besides new editions of Hengstenberg's commentary on John, De Wette on Acts, and different parts of Meyer's commentary, a number of new works on the New Testamant have lately appeared, of which we here notice the following.

The well known scholar, Dr. F. Delitzsch, is preparing a new translation of the New Testament into Hebrew. The Greek text used is the Codex Sinaiticus. The first volume that has appeared contains the *Epistle to the Romans*, with explanations from the "Talmud and Midrasch."

Dr. J. C. K. von Hofmann, author of the "Schriftbeweiss," is publishing a work entitled, "*Die heilige Schrift und Testament* zusammenhaengend untersucht." The fourth part of this work, containing Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, has recently appeared. The author occupies the evangelical stand-point in opposition to Rationalism and Pantheism.

Prof. Dr. H. Ewald, best known through his Hebrew grammars and works on the Old Testament, and the History of the Israelites, translates and explains, in one volume, the Epistles of *Peter* and *Jude*, and the *Epistles to the Ephesians, Timothy and Titus.*

Other Theological Works.—Dr. W. F. Gess, Prof. in Göttingen is engaged in writing a work on *Christ's Person and Work* according to the testimony of Christ and his Apostles. The first volume has appeared, containing the testimony of Christ (das Selbstzeugniss Christi). The second volume is intended to contain the testimony of the Apostles, whilst the third is to contain the doctrines to be drawn from this testimony of Christ and the Apostles. The first volume is both exegetical and historical, and, besides thorough research, has the same evangelical spirit as the other works of the author.

A. Ritschl has published the first volume of his work on the *Christian Doctrine* of *Justification and Redemption.* It has six hundred and fifty

pages, and contains the history of the doctrine. It is to be followed by a second volume containing the "Dogmatik"

Three works of Dr. J. T. Beck, of Tübingen, have lately been published: the second edition of his INTRODUCTION TO THE SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE; the sixth volume of his CHRISTLICHE REDEN and a small volume on the CHURCH AND STATE, in their relation to each other.

LUTHER'S PHILOSOPHY, by Theophilos, is the title of a new work. The first volume only has appeared. It contains "Die Logik." The second volume is to contain "Die Ethik." This effort to draw a connected system of philosophy from Luther's works, nearly all of which are practical, is new.

A number of works on the life of Luther have lately appeared. The well known work of M. Meurer on the LIFE OF LUTHER has appeared in a new and improved edition. Dr. E. T. Jaeckel gives the history of LUTHER AND HIS TIMES. H. Lang, in a volume of three hundred and thirty-nine pages on MARTIN LUTHER, ein religiöses Charakterbild, advocates the establishment of a German Church on Pantheistic principles. A small anonymous volume gives PICTURES OF THE FAMILY LIFE OF LUTHER. And Dr. Schenkel publishers a volume on LUTHER IN WORMS AND IN WITTENBERG and the renovation of the Church now.

Of the many works written in opposition to the assumptions and decrees of the late Romish Council, one of the most noteworthy is that of Dr. Schulte, entitled THE POWER OF THE POPES OF ROME OVER PRINCES, LANDS, NATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS, ACCORDING TO THEIR TEACHINGS AND ACTIONS SINCE GREGORY VII. The author is Professor of Ecclesiastical and German Law in the University of Prague. He stands in the foremost rank among the Professors of Ecclesiastical Law, and, until quite recently, was regarded as one of the main defenders of Roman Catholicism, and was classed with the Ultramontane party. In the Introduction of this work, of which the second edition, much improved, has appeared, he can appeal to the fact that he "has written much in defence of the Church and the Pope." But the late Council opened his eyes. Under thirteen rules the author embraces the doctrines of the Popes as to their political power, and proves every one of the rules by quotations from the Popes. Coming from such a source, and thus substantiated, we cannot doubt that these powers were actually claimed by the Popes. These powers were, according to Schulte, as follows:

I. The temporal power is of evil (vom Bösen) and must consequently be subject to the Pope.

II. The temporal power must act unconditionally according to the directions of the spiritual power.

III. The Church has the right to give and to take away any temporal dominion.

IV. The Pope has the right to give to Catholic sovereigns lands and na-

tions which are not Catholic, which these sovereigns are allowed to reduce to slavery.

V. The Pope can reduce to slavery or give away Christian subjects whose prince or government has been banished by the Pope.

VI. The ecclesiastical laws on ecclesiastical liberty and the power of the Pope are based on inspiration.

VII. The Church has the right to exercise an unconditional censorship of the press.

VIII. The Pope has a right to annul all State laws, compacts, constitutions, etc., and to release from all obligation to them, if they seem to be injurious to the Church, or to the Clergy.

IX. The Pope has a right to blame for transgression the temporal rulers, emperors and kings, and to punish them if necessary, and also to bring a matter involving a mortal sin before the spiritual tribunal.

X. Without consent of the Pope, no tax or duty can be imposed on any priest or church.

XI. The Pope has a right to release persons from their oaths to princes whom he has excommunicated, and to absolve them from all allegiance to them and obedience to their laws.

XII. The Pope can dissolve all the legal relations of banished persons, especially their marriage.

XIII. The Pope can absolve from all obligations (such as oaths and vows) either after or before they are taken.

Schulte argues that if the Popes are infallible, then their utterances are the absolute truth, and consequently the above rules, made by the Popes, are still in force and are of absolute authority.

The first volume of the LIFE OF SCHLEIERMACHER, by W. Dilthey, has been published. This volume of seven hundred pages gives an account of the first thirty-four years of the life of S. from 1768—1802. The second volume is to treat of the remainder of his life. The work will be read with much interest by those who appreciate the great influence of S. in modern theology. All available material has been placed at the command of the author, and the first volume is the result of great research.

THE GERMAN QUARTERLIES.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE GESAMMTE LUTHERISCHE THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. No. 3, 1871. Besides one hundred and twenty-two pages devoted to the review of books, and a few pages of miscellaneous matter by one of the Editors (Guericke), this Quarterly contains two articles, the first on the "Author of Ecclesiastes," by Martin Stier, the other entitled "Acta zur Kirchengeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts," which is a reprint of an attack on the University of Göttingen, made in 1774 by Prof. Reinhard in Buetzow and M. Ziegra in Hamburg. In comparing the first article with the book of Prof. Graetz (noticed above), we are struck by the difference in the results

attained in investigating the same internal evidences, and have another proof that great caution is necessary in accepting conclusions drawn exclusively from internal evidences. While Graetz thinks the Book of Ecclesiastes was written in the days of Herod, Stier comes to the conclusion that the book belongs to the age of Solomon, and that no other than Solomon was its author. He goes so far as to declare that Solomon would not have accomplished the mission which God gave him, if he had not written such a book!

Theologische Studien und Kritiken. No. 3, 1871. "The Cherubim in the Tabernacle and in the Temple," by E. Riehm. "The Relation of the Jews to Alexander the Great," by Dr. R. J. S. Henrichsen, translated from the Danish by Rev. P. Friedrichsen. "Tertullian's View of the Sacrament," by C. Leimbach. "On the Logos idea in John," by Dr. Roehricht (continued from a number in 1868). "On Kedorlaomer," by Prof. Dr. Julius Oppert.

Tertullian's view of the Sacraments is defined by Leimbach as follows: "They are all acts of the Church (Kirchliche Handlungen) which are based on the Scriptures, visible signs, but containing grace which is communicated through the visible signs and is accessible to all Christians; as a rule, however, they are administered only by the regularly called ministers."

Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie. No. 2, 1871. "On the method of the older History of Dogmas," by Prof. Dr. A. Ritschl of Göttingen. "The Moabite Stone, a Critical Review," by Dr. Diestel of Jena. "Studies in Melanchthon's Theology," second article, by Alb. Herrlinger, Repetent in Tübingen. "Theology and Natural Science," by Rev. Rud. Schmid. "The Nous" (νοῦς), by Rev. Dr. Kluge.

The article of H. discusses Melanchthon's view of the Lord's Supper in its original form and its later developments. The article of Schmid is an effort in the direction of harmonizing theology and the natural sciences. He speaks first of the lines that are to be drawn between theology and natural science, and lays down the following rules which are important both to the theologian and physicist. *a.* Theology must not arbitrarily embody in its own system, or attempt to force on natural science, propositions the investigations of which belongs exclusively to natural science. *b.* Theology must not let itself be influenced by natural science to adopt propositions which contradict essential principles of theology, or to abandon propositions which to theology are self-evident.

After laying down and enforcing these rules, the author discusses the influence of theology and natural science on each other. Near the close he quotes a sentence from the eminent scientist, R. Mayer, which is quite refreshing when compared with the utterances of many of his fellow-laborers. At Innsbruck he closed his address before the convention of naturalists, with these words: "With my whole heart I declare, that a correct

philosophy cannot and dare not be anything else than an introduction to the Christian religion."

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. No. 3, 1871. Rev. L. Krummel continues his interesting account of the "Utraquists and Taborites," a contribution to the history of the Bohemian Reformation in the fifteenth century. In this number he discusses the victory of the Utraquists over the Taborites, and the negotiations of the Bohemians with the Council of Basle. This includes the history from 1431—1436. Leimbach in this number also continues to discuss "Tertullian as a source for Christian Archæology."

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PROTESTANTISMUS UND KIRCHE. (Monthly). March—July, 1871. We shall notice only a few of the articles of this journal which is of a more popular character than those noticed above, and deals chiefly with the living questions of the day.

In the March number we find an interesting article on the Waldenses now in Italy. The article is based mainly on a report prepared for a Waldensean Synod. Dr. L. Desanctis, who was to have read the report, died Dec. 31, 1869. He was formerly Catholic Professor in Rome; but in comparing the decrees of the Council of Trent with the Bible, he found that Rome was at variance with the gospel, and then embraced the evangelical faith. Forsaking all his offices and dignities in Rome, he went to Turin, where he became a minister of the gospel, and afterwards he was a Professor in Florence. His death, on his sixty-first birth-day, adds a melancholy interest to the report on which the article is based, From the article we learn that besides 22,000 souls in the valleys of Piedmont, where for centuries they have been persecuted, the Waldenses now have 30 mission stations in Italy, in each of which there is at least one workman, such as a pastor, an evangelist, or a teacher, and in some of them all three are found. Then there are 25 or 30 other stations of less importance. These churches altogether are attended by 3,335 persons, and the number of communicants is 1,900. In 12 months there were 170 converts, and there are 325 catechumens. In their Sunday Schools they have 969 children. The contributions for all religious purposes in one year, amounted to 150,000 francs. In Venice the church has grown rapidly of late, and now has 225 communicants. Though they are weak, the Waldenses labor zealously to spread the gospel in Italy, and a number of instances are given which show that their labors are meeting with success.

In the April number the first article is on the "Independence of the Church." The first sentence shows the prevalent view on this subject in Germany. It is as follows: "There are few subjects on which all persons are so fully agreed as on the truth of this proposition: The Church should be independent of the State.

In the June and July numbers there is an article on the state of the churches in Alsace and German Lorraine, from which we take the follow-

ing statistics. The lands ceded by France to Germany in the treaty of Feb. 26, 1871, contains 212,178 Lutherans, 39,216 Reformed. The Catholics far outnumber the Protestants, but correct statistics were not within reach of the author. But their number in two of the five departments ceded to Germany, is 834,753. Among the men of Alsace who had an important influence on the Church, Philip Jacob Spener is mentioned, who was born in Rappoltsweiler, Alsace, and began his ministry in Strasburg.

J. H. W. S.

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

SCHULZE & GASSMAN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Dr. Martin Luther's House-Postil, or Sermons on the Gospels for the Sundays and Principal Festivals of the Church-Year. Vols. I. and II., pp. 362 & 454.

We hail with pleasure the appearance of the second volume of these sermons, and hope that it is an evidence of sufficient encouragement "for the publishers to go on and fulfil their purpose of completing the publication of the whole. These two volumes begin with First Sunday in Advent and end with Whit Monday, including, of course, the birth, passion and resurrection of our Divine Redeemer. They are not what, in modern style, would be called popular discussions, but they possess what is far better—the simplicity and power of the gospel. Some preachers, who are troubled to know how to make out a sermon on the great events of the Saviour's life and death, would do well to study the example of Luther. This prince of preachers, who could discourse before kings and nobles, could also preach to his own household. He tells us, in his own preface, that "these sermons were preached by me at certain times in my dwelling, in the presence of my household, that I, as the head of the family, might do my duty towards them, by instructing them how to lead a Christian life." Their use at the present day, in families, would serve the same purpose. Besides the intrinsic merit of these discourses, they possess an historic and homiletic value, as illustrating the style of the preaching of the great reformer. They are characterized by great simplicity, richness of scripture truth, and directness of address. If we had more preaching of this kind, we would hear more of the "power of the pulpit." We cordially commend these volumes to all the readers of the Review. The question will force itself upon us, why does not the Lutheran Publication Board publish something correspoding with its name and design?

THE LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, PHILADELPHIA,
117 North 6th Street.

THE JAVELIN. By a Lutheran. pp. 387.

This book has been made mainly with the scissors, from the files of the *Lutheran & Missionary*. It is named "The Javelin," in allusion to Num. 25 : 7. 8, on the assumption that it is to fulfil the same blessed office accomplished by that instrument, when in the hand of the zealous Phinehas its work stayed the ruin brought on by Israel's defection from the service of God. The writer seems, however, to have forgotten the difference between the service of the law and that of the gospel. The authorship is "By a Lutheran," but the writer withholds his name. We know not why. It may be a token of his modesty—not to prefix an humble name to so great a book. It may be a result of pride—not wishing to connect a great name with a poor one. Possibly it may be withheld from an impression that, to give it might damage the claim of the book to speak for Lutheranism, should the name recall to the reader the position assigned to its bearer by one high in authority, as himself, "one of the most un-Lutheran men in the Church."

A fair account of the book must state that a few of its chapters are ably written, presenting vigorous statements of Christian doctrine, and manifesting a holy zeal against some prevailing errors. Most of them, however, are only the partizan and controversial utterances, whose repetition in manifold forms has made them familiar to the readers of the *Lutheran & Missionary*. They are marked, in many places, by gross perversion of facts, bad spirit, and unfairness of argument. The re-publication, in book-form, of these papers, often discreditable to the columns of a weekly newspaper, presents an unusual manifestation of perverted sense of propriety. Such a book, so pervaded by misrepresentation, injustice, and petty quibbling, is, indeed, a token of degenerate manners and morals, and its publication can hardly be accounted for, without viewing it as meant to be an item, or fact, in confirmation of the author's opinion that growing disorders and increasing wickedness are heralding his predicted speedy coming of the millenium. The fact is a strong one. If he really meant to illstrate his theory, he has achieved an unquestionable success.

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

THE ATONEMENT; in its relations to the Covenant, the Priesthood, the Intercession of our Lord. By Rev. Hugh Martin, A. M., pp. 288.

TREATISE ON REGENERATION. By William Anderson, LL. D. pp. 311.

Although treating of quite different topics, these two works are coupled together, as they are from the same house, look very much alike externally, and belong to the same school of theology. The former is not a systematic treatise, but rather discussions of particular aspects and relations of the atonement. The views inculcated are of the strict federal

school. A chapter is devoted to an examination and exposure of Robertson's views of vicarious sacrifice. The latter is written with freshness and vigor, and is richly scriptural in its illustrations. Both of these volumes are far beyond common-place discussions of these momentous subjects. They contain strong meat and, whilst seasoned with a little of the old school Calvinistic spices, will help to nourish a sound orthodoxy. The modern refinements on these central doctrines of the Bible meet with no favor at the hands of these authors. They point very distinctly to 'the blood of the Cross, and the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

A Manual of Ancient History, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire. By George Rawlinson, A. M., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. pp. 633.

This is a book for students, and is a most valuable Manual. The learned author has prepared a work giving the results of extended and elaborate investigation. Much that has passed for Ancient History is little better than myths, and it requires skill and care to extract the truth. It is a great advantage as well as satisfaction to have a volume prepared by so competent a scholar. The best authorities are given, so that the student disposed to extend his studies is furnished with guides for further investigation. Arabia and India are passed over by Professor Rawlinson because he does not consider the material furnished as "trustworthy sources of history." Whilst we would like to have the judgment of such a scholar in regard to Arabia, India, China, etc., his reserve contrasts with the presumptuous dogmatism of some writers of history, who make the facts themselves, or accept every tradition.

The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson. Compiled from family letters and reminiscences by his great-grand-daughter, Sarah N. Randolph. pp. 432.

This is a very entertaining and instructive volume. It carries us to the home life of one of the greatest of American statesmen. The public life Thomas Jefferson belongs to the nation. As author of the Declaration of Independence and President of the United States, his fame has filled the world. But here we look in upon him as a student, a husband, a father, the head of a household, the centre of a social circle. His biographer has done her work delicately and well. The reading of this volume cannot but increase our admiration of a truly great man. In this age of superficial learning and dazzling show, there are many lessons of good, sound, common sense which it would be well for the countrymen of Jefferson to learn. His tenderness towards his wife and children is touching and beautiful, and his sage advice, on culture and manners, worthy of his great name. What we miss most of all, and feel even painfully, is the absence of any religious element. The lives of the greatest men make us more

sensible of the littleness and vanity of mortals, without God and without religion. As we follow Jefferson from his earliest life to the grave, and see him in joy and sorrow, in domestic bliss, and under the dark cloud, we sigh for the light of the Bible and the presence of the Divine Friend.

SCIENCE FOR THE YOUNG; or the Fundamental Principles of Modern Philosophy explained and illustrated in conversations and experiments, and in Narratives of Travel and Adventure by Young Persons in pursuit of Knowledge. By Jacob Abbott. Vol. I. Heat. pp. 306. Vol. II. Light. pp. 313.

This author attempts to popularize science. These volumes are beautifully gotten up, illustrated with numerous engravings, and made in every way attractive. Many of the most remarkable phenomena of heat and light are presented, and in a way to impress the mind. Though prepared with special reference to the young, these volumes will be found entertaining and instructive to older readers. The general diffusion of science is one of the encouraging signs of the age, and we hail with pleasure every addition in this direction. Mr. Abbott, who has accomplished so much in other departments for the young, will do good service in this new sphere of authorship. These volumes will sustain his popularity in writing for the young.

THE STUDENT'S ELEMENTS OF GEOLOGY. By Sir Charles Lyell, Bart., F. R. S., Author of "The Principles of Geology," "The Antiquity of Man, ect, 1871.

This work has been based, by the author, on his earlier work, the "Elements of Geology." It is not, however, a mere abridgment, but a new work, embodying in a concise form the general facts and principles of the science, according to the latest investigations and discoveries. It has been prepared with a special view to the necessities of beginners, and as a manual for class-room instruction. The arrangement is simple and clear, and the explanations are happy. The plan of the work excluded extended discussions, yet the whole subject is presented with that fulness and thoroughness which the eminent author's distinguished reputation and ability as a geologist. might be expected to furnish. Some inferences as to the antiquity of man, however, from some fossil human bones found among deposits in a few cases, and attributed to the Paleolithic age, it seems to us, are altogether too grave to be accepted on the basis of the given facts. More than six hundred illustrations and a full index, add value to the book. It is a manual of high excellence, and will doubtless soon be well known in our institutions of learning.

REINDEER, DOGS AND SNOW-SHOES. By Richard J. Bush.

In style of binding, as well as in contents, this is one of the most attractive books of its kind that we have read. It is a carefully kept journal of travel and exploration in Siberia, made in 1865, '66, and '67. Mr. Bush had excellent opportunities for studying the features of the country, and the habits of the people, attached as he was to the Russo-American Tele-

graph Expedition. Large portions of the country described, had never before been visited by an American or English traveler. As the language spoken by the people belongs to the Finnic Family, the proper names at first are somewhat awkward and ungainly. At times there is an unnecessary minuteness of detail, and if there be any defect in the book, it is that the author has violated the law of selection. In keeping a journal of this kind, it belongs to the highest art to know just what to state, and what to omit.

SCRIBNER & CO., NEW YORK.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH. Theologically and Homiletically expounded. By Dr, C. W. Edward Naegelsbach, pastor in Bayreuth, Bavaria. Translated, enlarged, and edited by Samuel Ralph Asbury, Rector of Trinity Church, Morristown, N. J. With THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH. By the same author. Translated, enlarged and edited by W. H. Hornblower, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Patterson, N. J. pp. 446 and 196.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN. By John Peter Lange, D. D., Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn. Translated from the German. Revised, enlarged, and edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 654.

These are two more volumes of Lange's Commentary on the Old and New Testament, and are among the most interesting and valuable of that great work. The reading public are already somewhat acquainted with the character of this work—with its great merits, and serious defects. Each of these new volumes has a special interest. That on Jeremiah is the fullest and most comprehensive in our language, and especially needed. We have less that is critical and valuable on Jeremiah than on most of the other books of the Old Testament. This volume will supply a felt want. The distinguished scholar, Dr. Naegelsbach, author of this commentary on Jeremiah, dissents from the current view as to the authorship of the Lamentations. Dr. Hornblower, the translator of this part of the volume, furnishes an able reply to Dr. Naegelsbach's dissertation, and defends the commonly received view. The entire volume has received valuable additions by the translators. It must take the first rank among commentaries on this Prophet.——The volume on John's Gospel is by Dr. Lange himself, but the additions to the American edition are so great as to make it "to a large extent a new work." The death of Dr. Yeomans, who had undertaken to prepare this volume for the American press, devolved the labor on Dr. Schaff, who, with some assistance from others, completed the task. It could hardly have fallen into more competent hands. The Gospel of St. John is justly regarded as one of the most difficult, as well as most valuable, portions of the inspired writings. For spiritual depth it is unsurpassed, if not unequaled. It has been the object of persistent assaults by rationalists, but it stands the noblest monument of inspired wisdom, and displaying the fulness of divine love and grace. This commen-

tary will aid in unfolding the meaning of the author, and will also supply a large amount of critical material. The student will find it very full, and if not always satisfactory, at least more so than perhaps any other single commentary.

These make twelve volumes of this ponderous work—three on the Old Testament, and nine on the New. One more volume, that on the Apocalypse, will complete the New Testament portion. This is in "able hands," and will appear with "a full Index of the whole work."

CARLTON & LANAHAN, NEW YORK.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. Translated from the French of M. Emert Naville. By John P. Lacroix, Professor in the Ohio Wesleyan University. pp. 330.

The merit of this volume is evidenced by the fact, that although but recently published in the original, this is the second translation into English, having been already published by the Clarkes of Edinburgh. This claims to be "the only authorized translation." The author has won the reputation of being one of the most profound thinkers and vigorous writers of the old world. He is yet but in the maturity of his strength, and, by his works already published, gives promise of further contributions to the cause of truth and sound philosophy.

The present volume embraces seven lectures, with the titles: The Good; Evil; The Problem; The Solution; The Proof; The Conflict of Life; The Source of Strength. They were delivered to large and attentive audiences, first in Geneva, and afterwards in Lausanne, during the winter of 1867–68. Though popular in style, they touch on some of the most intricate and perplexing questions of human inquiry. The dark Problem of Evil is discussed, and if not solved, is stripped of some of its difficulties, and the whole subject set in a more hopeful and cheering light. The reading of the volume does not, as is the case with some discussions of the same subject, oppress the mind by dark and gloomy pictures with no light to shine upon the darkness. It gives tone and elasticity to the mental and moral powers. The atmosphere is fresh and bracing, if every cloud is not swept away. The author does not dogmatize, nor does he profess to remove all difficulties. His solution of the Problem of Evil is substantially that of the Bible, as interpreted by orthodox theologians, though presented under a philosophic form. He is not afraid to advance and defend the philosophy of the Fall in Adam, and Redemption through divine interposition. He earnestly maintains individual freedom and responsibility along with the doctrine of the Fall of the whole race through the sin of the first man. The individuality, and yet, what is called, the solidarity, of the human family, are prominent features in these discussions. No solution of the Problem of Evil is likely to prove entirely satisfactory. It would be easy to start difficulties to what is here presented. Yet, on the whole, it is one of the most interesting, and altogether most readable, discussions of this

unfathomable subject. The book is very neat and attractive in appearance, and will be read with interest.

THE MISSION OF THE SPIRIT, By Rev. L. R. Dunn.

"Were I as eloquent as the Holy Ghost, I could convert souls as well as He," is the blasphemous remark of a rationalist. The present age may not be as gross in its expression of disbelief in divine agency, but there is great confidence in human resources. Man has achieved such wonders in the world of matter, that he carries a consciousness of his strength with him in the wider world of spirit. We need such books as this of Mr. Dunn, to rebuke the pride that ignores or forgets the great doctrine of divine help in our salvation. It is a popular and scriptural presentation of the office and work of the Comforter, in human redemption. It will be a useful book among the people, for it is when we honor the Spirit, in recognizing his official work, that he honors us in his converting and saving power.

COMMENTARY ON ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND ROMANS. By D. D. Whedon, LL. D.

This volume is one of a series on the books of the New Testament, and in general character, is the same as the commentaries of Barnes and Jacobus. The author aims to do for the Metbodist Church, what has been done by the above writers for the Presbyterian. The book has one noticeable and excellent feature. There is a clearness and compactness of expression, which often reminds us of Bengel's Gnomon. The condensation and sharpness of statement sometimes brings out the thought on you with a kind of surprise. A single, short sentence frequently opens to us the very heart of a passage. The collation of texts is apposite and suggestive, while the illustrations by maps and plates, is all that could be desired. The only blemish we have detected, is an occasional bitterness in reference to opposing doctrinal views. It will be proper to add, that these commentaries of Dr. Whedon have received the most flattering commendations from prominent writers in all branches of the Church.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER.

A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS, IN GREEK, according to the Text of Tischendorf; with a collation of the Textus Receptus, and of the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. By Frederick Gardiner, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School, author of "A Commentory on the Epistle of St. Jude," "A Harmony of the Gospels in English," etc.

From the earliest periods of Christianity, Christian scholars have been arranging Harmonies of the Gospels. This has arisen from the natural desire to throw the four evangelical narratives into the unity of a single and complete Life of the Redeemer. As the various facts and incidents of the several accounts fall into agreement in their right place, they receive the light of an easier and happier explanation. With the progress in Biblical knowledge, improved Harmonies have been successively prepared.

It is to the conviction that discussion has prepared the way for a further improvement, that we owe the work before us.

Dr. Gardiner's work has been well done, and he has given us a Harmony of great value. In its general characteristics it resembles that of Dr. Robinson, which has been the almost universal authority in this country. The Gospel of St. John is taken as the basis of the chronological arrangement, and our Lord's ministry is viewed according to the Quadripaschal scheme as extending over about three years and a half. The work has the advantage of the Greek text according to the eighth edition of Tischendorf, in which are embodied the results of the closest collation with the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the latest criticism. A difference of type indicates all divergences from the *Textus Receptus.* Quotations from the Old Testament are given in full in the margin, and brief notes, relating only to matters of harmony, are placed at the bottom. A General Introduction, of high merit, explains the grounds for the method of harmony adopted. A new feature of special value is the Synoptical Table of the arrangement adopted in five of the principal recent Harmonies, those of Greswell, Stroud, Robinson, Thomson, and Tischendorf, compared with his own. This table shows the fundamental agreement of the different harmonists, in the method and order of combining the gospel accounts.

The book has been gotten out with good paper and clear type, and should be in the hands of every minister and theological student.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK.

Six Boys; A Mother's Story.

Bible Sketches and their Teachings. By Samuel G. Green.

Both these books have the imprint of the American Tract Society, Boston, and are issued from the Riverside Press, Cambridge. The scene of the first one is laid in New York and vicinity, at the close of the Revolutionary War. The characters are sharply drawn, the story told in excellent style, and the whole colored with the manners and customs of the time.

The second volume is the third series of Bible Sketches, illustrating the life of Christ. It is one of the very best Sabbath School books we have ever read, and we heartily wish our libraries might be supplied with more such books, so simple, and yet so rich in truth.

UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Jesus: His Life and Work, as narrated by the four Evangelists. By Howard Crosby.

The multiplication of works on the life of Christ, is a token for good. The more that life is studied and dwelt upon, the greater will be the power going forth from it. What He was, and taught, and did, must furnish the foundations of Theology, and be the guide of practical piety.

The histories of the life of Christ are of different kinds, as they are

written with different aims. Some, prepared from a rationalistic standpoint, as those of Strauss and Renan, are but arbitrary portraitures of that life, in utter disregard of the gospel accounts, and eliminating all its supernatural elements. Some, as that of Ellicott, written with apologetical and critical aim, are scholarly works of reference and authority. Others, prepared for practical ends and popular use, are warm snd glowing exhibitions, in the unity and continuity of one biography, of the gospel accounts of the wonderful life of the Redeemer. Of this kind is the work of Dr. Crosby. In fidelity to the inspired narratives of the four evangelists, he has aimed, on the basis of a Harmony arranged for the purpose, to present a connected and full view of the life and ministry of Jesus. The author has brought to his work fine scholarship and enlarged philological and biblical knowledge, and has given us a volume of great interest and value. The style, though not very highly ornate, is vigorous and graphic, and many of his pictures of scenes and events are drawn with great beauty and power.

We are not prepared to accept the author's doctrine of the person of Christ, on page 256. It is but incidently introduced, and we are referred to the "Appendix." But no Appendix appears in the volume. And the book is better without it. The doctrine is a revived *Kenoism*, which we believe to be in conflict with the plain teaching of the Gospel. It is, indeed, forgotten and set aside in the author's own phraseology elsewhere. Though in one place he says of Christ's Godhead, that "it was mysteriously unused" during his earthly life, in another place he says, in connection with the raising of Lazarus, "Many a Jew was convinced beyond resistance by this sublime exhibition of the presence of God in the life and actions of Jesus." The author, thus, corrects his own error.

But, apart from this, the work is one of great excellence—a valuable contribution to this department of Christian literature. It will have the greatness of usefulness.

CHARLES C. CHATFIELD & CO., NEW HAVEN.

FOUR YEARS AT YALE. By a Graduate of '69.

College life is singular. It is a little world in itself, and has its own laws and customs. It develops a style of thought and character, that, ordinarily, can be formed under no other influences. Nothing but this fact would justify a volume of this description. Its design is to give a view of the inner life of Yale, and the book will be read with lively interest by those at all conversant with Colleges. The contents are arranged under three general topics, each topic treated in five chapters. The three topics are: The Society System, The Student Life, The Official Curriculum. Besides these, there is an introductory chapter of a historical character, and a concluding one, making an earnest plea for our Colleges. The plan is admirably executed, and the interest is maintained to the close, through a mass of detail which would weary, but for those deep and ever fresh im-

pressions, which one carries through life from his college work. Perhaps, if there be any fault in the execution of the plan, it is that the features of the Society system are too much magnified. We would have been pleased with more pertaining to the work proper of the Institution. While the impression from the book as to the description and work of the College, is in the highest degree favorable, two things have specially arrested our attention. One is the mass of rubbish which has gathered in the progress of years along the course of study. The boating clubs, and eating clubs, and singing clubs, and social clubs, and literary clubs, and clubs for almost every purpose, good and bad, are a curious feature. One wonders where time is found for the studies, and is tempted to ask, Is not the curriculum of study, after all, only a secondary matter? Then these numerous organizations must add largely to the student's expenses. It is no wonder that the doors of some of our larger and older Colleges are gradually being closed against all but the sons of the rich, when such a complicated system must be maintained. At a time when the friends of Yale are so earnestly discussing her interests, and devising means for her increased efficiency, would it not be well to reduce the College life to greater simplicity, and sweep away, if possible, this mighty accumulation. The other thing which we have noticed, is the toleration of lawlessness. Custom seems to have sanctioned practices, which, beyond the College walls, would consign the actors to a felon's cell. In College it may be called sport, but in society it goes by the name of theft and ruffianism. It is a matter of surprise, that there is not enough good, healthy public sentiment in Yale, or enough regard for law and order in New Haven, to correct these abuses, perpetrated year after year with impunity. We think we can detect some improvement in these things, as several old ceremonies, worthy only a dark age, have been abandoned. Let the reform be carried yet further, and let our young men carry with them from their Christian homes a deeper sense of honor and truth and right, and feel, that though shut in by college walls, they are not beyond the reach of law and public sentiment.

PAMPHLETS, ETC.

The Sowers Reward. By the author of Mary Powell. T. B. Peterson, Philadelphia.

Steadfastness in Doctrine and in Duty; A Sermon by Dr. Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., delivered at the opening of the 124th Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, Easton, Trinity Sunday, June 4th, 1871.

A Classified Catalogue of Theological and Religious Books, comprising a large collection of standard works, American and Foreign; old and rare Works, and recent Publications, to September 1, 1871, for sale by Smith, English & Co, Booksellers and Importers (especially of Theological Books), No. 710 Arch St., Philadelphia, 1871.

A priced Catalogue, of great value, especially to clergymen and others who desire to purchase theological and religious works.

The following Books have been received, and will be noticed in the next Number:

FROM ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK,
Through Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

GRAND-FATHER'S FAITH, by Julia Mathews.

A HOUSE IN TOWN, A Sequel to "Opportunes," by the author of the "Wide wide World."

LILLY NORRIS' ENEMY, by Joanna H. Mathews, author of "Bessie Books," etc.

NATURE'S WONDERS, by the Rev. Richard Newton, D. D.

JESSIE'S PARROT, by Joanna H. Mathews.

FRENCH BESSIE, by P. E. S., author of "Tibby the Charrooman," etc.

THE RIFT IN THE CLOUDS, by the author of "Memorials of Capt. Hedley Vicars."

STORIES OF VINEGAR HILL. Six distinct Volumes, on different subjects, put together in paper case.

SHALL WE KNOW ONE ANOTHER, and other Papers, by the Rev. J. C. Kyle, M. A., Third Edition.

WARREN F. DRAPER, ANDOVER.

DIATESSARON. THE LIFE OF OUR LORD IN THE WORDS OF THE GOSPELS, by Frederick Gardiner, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School, author of "A Harmony of the Gospels in Greek," etc.

CHARLES C. CHATFIELD & CO., NEW HAVEN.

No. 6—*University Series.* THE ACTION OF NATURAL SELECTION ON MAN, by Alfred Russel Wallace.

VALEDICTORY POEM AND ORATION, pronounced before the Senior Class in Yale College, Presentation Day, July 11, 1871.

THE DURATION AND NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by Henry Constable, A. M., Prebendary of York. Reprinted from the Second London Edition.

ZIEGLER & M'CURDY, PHILADELPHIA.

QUESTIONS OF MODERN THOUGHT; or Lectures on The Bible and Infidelity, by James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., J. P. Thompson, D. D. LL. D., Wm. Adams, D. D., Philip Schaff, D. D., Wm. Hague, D. D., E. O. Haven, D. D. LL. D.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

Article. Page.

I. New Obedience,..... 485

By Rev. Charles A. Stork, Baltimore, Md.

II. The Religious Training of the Children of the Church,..... 520

By Rev. L. M. Kuhns, Canton, Ohio.

III. The Apocalypse of St. John,..... 535

Translated from the French by Rev. L. W. Heydenreich, Graduate of the University of France.

IV. Church Problems Solved by History,..... 557

By Rev. F. W. Conrad, D.D., Philadelphia.

V. Papal Infallibility,..... 585

IV. Literary Intelligence,..... 621

VII. Notices of New Books,..... 628

AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—General Literature.

BRITISH.

Historical—Scientific and Philosophical.

GERMAN.

Biblical—Other Theological Works.

THE GERMAN QUARTERLIES.

"Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche"—"Theologische Studien und Kritiken"—"Jarbücher für Deutsche Theologie"—"Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie"—"Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche."

NEW BOOKS.

Dr. Martin Luther's House-Postil—The Javelin—The Atonement—Treatise on Regeneration—A Manual of Ancient History—The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson—Science for the Young—The Student's Elements of Geology—Reindeer, Dogs, and Snow-Shoes—The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah—The Gospel according to John—The Problem of Evil—The Mission of the Spirit—Commentary on Acts of the Apostles and Romans—A Harmony of the Four Gospels, in Greek—Six Boys—Bible Sketches and their Teachings—Jesus: His Life and Work, as narrated by the Four Evangelists—Four Years at Yale.

PAMPHLETS, ETC.

The Sower's Reward—Steadfastness in Doctrine and in Duty—A Classified Catalogue of Theological and Religious Books.

OK STORE
o. Second St.
RISBURGH, PA.